CORNERSTONE
MINNESOTA STATE UNIVERSITY MANKATO

Speaker & Gavel

Volume 48 | Issue 2 Article 6

January 2011

Complete Issue 48(2)

Speaker & Gavel

Volume 48, Issue 2, 2011

Speaker & Gavel

Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha
National Honorary Forensic Society
www.dsr-tka.org/

Editor
Stephen M. Croucher, Ph.D.
Department of Communication
Lowell Thomas 212
Marist College
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601
Stephen.Croucher@marist.edu
(845) 575-3650 (o) (845) 575-3885 (f)

Editor's Note:
S&G went to an entire online format with volume 41/2004 of the journal. The journal will be available online at: www.dsr-tka.org/ The layout and design of the journal will *not* change in the online format. The journal will be available online as a pdf document. A pdf document is identical to a traditional hardcopy journal. We hope enjoy and utilize the new format.

Speaker & Gavel

http://www.dsr-tka.org/
Volume 48 (2) / 2011

Table of Contents

Speaker & Gavel

Delta Sigma Rho—Tau Kappa Alpha
National Honorary Forensic Society
www.dsr-tka.org/

Organizational Identification Strategies of a Low Face-to-Face Member-Contact Organization

Deepa Oommen
Minnesota State University Mankato

Abstract

This study looked at the identification seeking strategies of a low face-to-face member-contact organization, *The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi*. I used thematic analysis to identify the strategies that the organization used to seek the identification of its members. Findings of the study showed that by emphasizing membership as an exclusive privilege, recognizing the individual as a symbol of excellence, celebrating member achievements, inviting member contributions, emphasizing commitment to diversity, emphasizing organizational symbolism and highlighting testimonials of appreciation, the organization tried to seek the identification of its members. In many of the above-mentioned strategies, the overarching theme of elitism was evident. This raises certain pertinent questions pertaining to organizational identification.

Keywords: organizational identification, identification strategies

Introduction

Member identification is important for any organization. Early research in the area of organizational identification revealed that organizational identification leads to decision-making consonant with the values and beliefs of the organization (Simon, 1977). In more recent years, research in the field of organizational identification has revealed that organizational identification is linked to a host of other variables like organizational commitment, support, loyalty, and a variety of organizational citizenship behaviors (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Scott, Corman, & Cheney, 1998; Van Dick, Grojean, Christ, & Wieseke, 2006). Hence, organizations use a variety of rhetorical strategies to gain the identification of their members (Adler, 1995; Cheney, 1983a; Vaughn, 1997). In addition to rhetorical strategies, the communal organizational experience also strengthens identification. However, not all organizations provide the opportunity for members to experience the feeling of community. In spite of that they continue to survive and flourish. This study examines the identification strategies employed by one such organization, The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi.

Most studies in the field of organizational identification have examined the identification strategies of organizations where members actively participate in the organization in a face-to-face context and consequently, experience the physical presence of the organization. However, studies have not looked at how a low face-to-face member-contact organization seeks the identification of its members (Low face-to-face member-contact organization does not imply that the organizational members meet virtually. The communication is mainly one-sided in the form of e-mail newsletters, the print magazine and the organization-

al website). Hence, this study examines the identification strategies of such an organization.

An examination of the identification strategies of such an organization is important because, as pointed out by Scott (2001), in spite of the numerous advantages that mediated communication technologies offer organizations, the use of these technologies could result in reduced levels of attachment among organizational members because of the prevalence of one-way information sharing and limited interactivity. One-way information sharing and limited interactivity make organizational members vulnerable to the influence of other identification seeking entities; previous research has indicated individuals come under the influence of multiple organizational entities and individuals identify differentially with each of these entities (Hughes & Ahearne, 2010; Scott, 1997, 2007). In essence, it can be said that multiple identities may compete for securing individuals' identification (Scott, 1997). Hence, it is important to understand how an organization faced with the challenge posed by limited interactivity and one-way information sharing seeks the identification of its members. As mentioned before, organizational identification is important for any organization because of the variety of benefits it can reap from strongly identified members.

This study contributes to the existing research in organizational identification in two major ways. First, it looks at how an organization seeks identification in the context of an unconventional form of organizing. Organizing is unconventional, considering the fact that the organization has very little face-to-face or personal contact with its members. Second, it points to the fact that the nature of organizing may be a major factor that influences the kind of identification strategies an organization may adopt. In addition to the two major contributions, the implications of the study also raise certain pertinent questions associated with organizational identification. This report begins with an examination of the literature pertaining to organizational identification, followed by a brief description of the organization (The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi), a description of the method, a presentation of the results, and a discussion of the findings.

Organizational Identification

Cheney (1983a) defined identification as, "an active process by which individuals link themselves to elements in the social scene" (p. 342). Securing the identification of members is important for organizations. According to Tompkins and Cheney (1983), "A person identifies with a unit when in making a decision, the person in one or more of his or her organizational roles perceives that unit's values or interests as relevant in evaluating the alternatives of the choice" (p.144). Simon (1977) clearly explained this process. According to him, values of the organization are internalized in organizational members and consequently, influence their psychological make-up and attitudes. This, in essence, leads to a sense of attachment or loyalty that ensures that the decisions the individuals make are in consonance with the organizational objectives. In a study of the organizational identification of Teaching Assistants, Tompkins and Cheney (1983) found identification influenced attitudes and behaviors that had consequences for decision-making. Cheney's (1983b) study of a large industrial and

high technology corporation also revealed similar findings. Thus, Cheney (1983b) said organizational identification leads to reformulation of self-images in consonance with the values and beliefs of the organization. In recent years, researchers viewing organizational identification from a social identity perspective have further stressed the importance of organizational identification.

Organizational Identification as Social Identification

According to Tajfel and Turner (1986), " …in relevant intergroup situations, individuals will not interact as individuals on the basis of their individual characteristics or interpersonal relationships, but as members of their groups standing in defined relationships to members of other groups (p.10)." Drawing from the work of these theorists, Ashforth and Mael (1989) looked at organizational identification from the perspective of social identification. According to them, "The individual's organization may provide one answer to the question, who am I?" (p. 22). Thus, organizational identification can lead to the formation of social identity. In a similar vein, Bhattacharya, Rao, and Glynn (1995) said social identification with an organization leads to a person defining him or herself in terms of the membership of that organization. Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1994) took a step further and defined organizational identification as the degree to which individual members define themselves in terms of the same attributes they believe the organization has. In short, identification with an organization, as Van Knippenberg and Sleebos (2006) found, involves psychological oneness with the organization.

Social identification with the organization has a number of important consequences beyond the favoring of organizational interests in day-to-day organizational decision-making. According to Ashforth and Mael (1989), these consequences include internalization of and adherence to organizational values and norms; homogeneity in attitudes and behaviors; intra-group cohesion, cooperation, and altruism (in matters pertaining to the group); organizational commitment, support, and loyalty; and positive organizational evaluations. According to Hogg and Terry (2000), social identification with an organization could lead to prototype-based depersonalization, which could in turn foster organizational cohesion and adherence to organizational norms. Bhattacharya at al. (1995) found that in the case of an art museum, social identification of the members with the organization was positively associated with donating tendencies, membership tenure, and frequency of visits. According to Scott et al. (1998) and Van Dick et al. (2006), identification with an organization leads to the performance of organizational citizenship behaviors. Thus organizational identification, in terms of social identification, leads to organizational commitment, organizational cohesion, adherence to organizational norms and organizational citizenship behaviors.

However, organizational identification in terms of social identification is related to a number of other factors. For instance, Bhattacharya et al. (1995) found social identification of the members with the art museum was positively associated with its prestige. Similarly, Bartels, Pruyn, de Jong, and Joustra (2007), in the case of a regional police organization, and Smidts, Pruyn, and Van Riel

(2001), in the case of a bank, a non-profit customer service company, and a nationally operating utilities company, found perceived organizational prestige positively predicted organizational identification. According to Dutton et al. (1994), attractiveness of the organizational identity, consistency between the individual identity and the organizational identity, distinctiveness of the organizational image, perception of organizational image as enhancing self-esteem, and attractiveness of the external image of the organization strengthen organizational identification. Hence, it is imperative for organizations to inculcate these notions in the minds of their members. This leads to organizations using diverse strategies aimed at inculcating such notions to secure the identification of their members.

Strategies Organizations Use to Secure the Identification of Members

Organizations use a variety of strategies to gain the identification of their members. Cheney's (1983a) study showed organizations used strategies like expression of concern for the individual, recognition of individual contributions, espousal of shared values, advocacy of shared benefits and activities, praise by outsiders, testimonials by employees, expression of the need to unify against a common enemy, expression of the assumed or transcendental "we" and symbolic unification to gain the identification of their members. Similarly Adler (1995), found the expression of shared values and goals, and the assumed or transcendental 'we' in the letters written by two Lutheran church leaders to their brethren. Driskill and Camp (2006) found, in the case of the Nehemiah group (an inter-organizational consortium of churches), the prevalence of rhetorical strategies of identification that emphasized prayer and relationship building. According to Vaughn (1997), high technology organizations used strategies that espoused shared values like innovation, quality, equality, individualism, and teamwork to seek the identification of their members. Connaughton and Jarvis (2004) found the GOP in order to seek the identification of Latino voters depicted them as satisfied citizens and engaged family members in their political advertisements.

Thus, organizations use diverse strategies to engage their members. Most of these strategies stem from the Burkean rhetoric of identification that emphasizes consubstantiality (Burke, 1969). However, the nature of organizing in most of the above-mentioned organizations involves frequent face-to-face contact or the feeling of the physical presence of the organization. Studies have shown that socialization processes that involve social interactions in the organizational context play a major role in creating a sense of identification with the organization. Bourassa and Ashforth (1998) pointed out the socialization process of new crewmembers on an Alaskan fishing trawler through interactions with senior crew members led to their identification with the culture of the trawler. In addition, according to the structurational model of organizational identification postulated by Scott et al. (1998), socialization process plays a major role in identity creation. They state that a well-socialized member may have a strong organizational identity as the socialization process contributes to an increase in identity size. According to them, the social interactions that take place in the organiza-

tional context aid in the formation and expressions of identities. Hence, it would be interesting to explore how in the absence of opportunities for socializing members in the traditional manner, which involves frequent contacts with the organization, a low face-to-face member-contact organization tries to secure the identification of its members. Specifically the question that arises is whether the nature of organizing, in terms of the low frequency of contact with the members, especially face-to-face contact, influences the identification strategies that an organization may employ. In order to explore this issue, this study looks at the case of one such organization, The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi.

The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi

The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi, founded in 1897, has its headquarters in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The mission of the society is to recognize and encourage superior academic scholarship. Its mission statement is as follows: "To Recognize and promote academic excellence in all fields of higher education and to engage the community of scholars in service to others" ("The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi", n.d.).

The society invites faculty and students, based on their academic and professional excellence, to become members. The society has more than 300 chapters in universities across the United States, Puerto Rico and the Philippines. Each year, the society inducts 30,000 members through its chapters. Since its inception, it has inducted more than a million members. Once inducted, one becomes a member for life. However, to be an active member one has to pay an annual membership fee. In addition, the society also charges national and chapter fees at the time of initiation. Members are eligible for benefits like awards and scholarships, discounts with partner organizations, career-related services like job search, etc ("The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi", n.d.).

In spite of the fact that the organization has chapters in member universities, there are very few meetings or gatherings of members after the initiation ceremony. The chapter directories reveal most chapters did not even have a chapter webpage on their university website. Those that had chapter web-pages did not reveal many activities other than initiation events.

The main organization organizes a triennial convention for its members. However, very few students attend this event. According to Rogow (2007), the current president of the organization, the most recent convention held at Orlando Florida had thirty students participating. He says this was the largest number of students present at any convention in the history of the organization. This number is low considering the fact that the organization has a total of 300 chapters in North America and the Philippines. According to president Rogow, it was for the first time student members were encouraged to attend. He further added

> These students added enthusiasm and an exciting dimension to the meeting. Because the society exists to recognize the academically best and brightest students in our colleges and universities, these students need to feel welcomed as full participating members in all aspects of our organization, not just at chapter initiations and meetings. (p. 1)

Consequently, the organization amended its bylaws, which allowed two students to join the Board of Directors in 2010. The question that arises is, in spite of the fact that members rarely meet, how does the organization seek the identification of its members. The question is relevant considering the fact that member identification is essential for the sustenance of this organization as it depends on member contributions, in terms of membership fee and other contributions, for a substantial portion of its funding ("Annual Report", 2005-2006). Moreover, in spite of the low face-to-face member-contact nature of the organization, it has nearly 100,000 active members and the chapters initiate 30,000 members every year. Hence, this study seeks to answer the following research question:

RQ: What strategies does The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi use to secure the identification of its members?

Method

Text

To identify the strategies used, I examined the membership invitations; the organizational website (Phi Kappa Phi.org); four issues of the print magazine *The Phi Kappa Phi Forum* (fall 2006, winter/spring 2007, fall 2007, and winter/spring 2008); and the monthly e-mail newsletter sent between August 2006 and April 2008 (*Monthly Mentions*). The organizational website, Phi Kappa Phi.org, has information about the history of the organization, chapters, membership, and publications. The print magazine, *The Phi Kappa Phi Forum*, is a quarterly magazine that features articles on a wide variety of general topics, member news, chapter news, society news and other pertinent announcements. *Monthly Mentions* is an e-mail communication that keeps members informed of the opportunities they can avail of and the activities of the society.

Procedure

I used thematic analysis to explore the identification strategies that The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi employed. I used Owen's (1984) criteria for identifying themes in a relational discourse. Since the motive behind organizational identification strategies is to build a relationship with organizational members to gain their identification, Owen's criteria for identifying themes in a relational discourse was appropriate for this study.

Owen's (1984) criteria for identifying themes in a relational discourse included *recurrence*, *repetition*, and *forcefulness*. In this particular study, I combined 'recurrence' and 'repetition.' According to Owen recurrence was observed, "When at least two parts of a report had the same thread of meaning, even though different wording indicated such a meaning" (p. 275). 'Repetition' is closely tied to 'recurrence'. Owen states, "Criterion two [repetition] is an extension of criterion one [recurrence] in that it is an explicit repeated use of the same wording, while criterion one involves an implicit recurrence of meaning using different discourse" (p. 275). Hence, in this study the criterion 'recur-

rence' not only involved implicit recurrence of meaning, using different words, but also recurrence of meaning through the repetition of the same wording. The following statements are exemplars of the criterion of 'recurrence':

> However, Phi Kappa Phi is much more than an emblem and a line on a résumé. It is a global network comprised of the best and brightest from all academic disciplines—a community of scholars and professionals building an enduring legacy for future generations.
>
> Phi Kappa Phi is much more than a line on a résumé. If you choose to accept this once-in-a-lifetime offer, you will join a select community of top scholars and professionals and gain access to resources and Benefits [*sic*] designed to serve your academic and professional needs.

Here, the two statements convey the same meaning that the organizational membership is a membership in a prestigious club of excellence.

The next criterion 'forcefulness' refers to the emphatic nature of the identification messages. Specifically, it involves the use of action verbs, action phrases, action statements, strong verbs, adverbs, adjectives, exclamation marks (!), superlatives, emphatic statements, and bold typefaces. The following statement meets the criterion of forcefulness:

"*Founded* in 1897 at the University of Maine, Phi Kappa Phi is the nation's *oldest*, *largest*, and *most* selective honor society for all academic disciplines." Here the use of the action verb *founded*, and superlatives like *oldest*, *largest*, and *most* convey the strength of the statement, which communicates the prestigious nature of the society. I used recurrence as the primary criterion for developing categories of identification strategies. Forcefulness indicated the strength of the identification strategies.

To categorize the identification strategies, I used the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The constant comparative method involved an initial stage of coding that looked for recurring themes and a final stage of coding that combined similar themes into larger themes. The initial coding resulted in 11 categories. Subsequently, I combined similar categories. For example, I combined categories that reflected the selective nature of the membership and the importance of that membership into a single category called *emphasizing membership as an exclusive privilege*. Similarly, I combined the category that portrayed the individual as a symbol of academic excellence and the category that portrayed the individual as a symbol of excellence in character into a single category called *recognizing the individual as a symbol of excellence*; the category that emphasized no discrimination based on the individual's personal background and the category that portrayed no discrimination based on the individual's academic background into a single category called *emphasizing commitment to diversity*; and the category that referred to testimonials of appreciation for the service offered by the organization and the category that referred to the testimonials of appreciation of the mission of the organization into a single category

called *highlighting testimonials of appreciation*. This resulted in a final set of seven categories.

Findings

The study sought to explore the identification strategies The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi employed to seek the identification of its organizational members. The findings of the study revealed the evidence of the following identification strategies: emphasizing membership as an exclusive privilege, recognizing the individual as a symbol of excellence, celebrating member achievements, inviting member contributions, emphasizing commitment to diversity, emphasizing organizational symbolism and highlighting testimonials of appreciation.

Emphasizing membership as an exclusive privilege

This identification strategy emphasized the selective nature of the organizational membership and the importance of that membership. The organization highlighted that the possession of a membership with it was as an exclusive privilege. The following statements I found on the organizational website highlighted this fact:

> The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi is the nation's oldest and most selective all-discipline honor society. Standards for election are extremely high. Membership is by invitation only to the top 10 percent of seniors and graduate students and 7.5 percent of juniors.

These statements convey a message of exclusivity by portraying the selective nature of the membership privilege. To be eligible for membership, an individual has to meet the organizational standards of academic excellence. Thus, the organization is seeking the identification of its members by highlighting its selective nature. Specifically, the organization is conveying the elitist nature of its membership. Similar to the statement mentioned above, I also found another message of exclusivity in the membership invitation, which stated:

> Join the million-strong ranks of Phi Kappa Phi and stand along scholars and innovators such as Jimmy Carter, 39th President of the United States; James Barksdale, Founder of Netscape; Ellis Marshall, Acclaimed Jazz Musician; Glenna Goodacre, internationally acclaimed sculptor; George Olah, Nobel Prize Winner in Chemistry; John Grisham, Best-Selling Author; Wendy Lawrence, NASA Astronaut; Kim Mulkey-Robertson, Head Women's Basketball Coach at Baylor University; and Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Supreme Court Justice.

This statement points out that the organizational membership is a membership in a celebrity club. Celebrity club memberships are not open to everybody. It is the privilege of the elite. This statement like the other statements points to the selective nature of the membership.

In addition, there were other statements that conveyed the importance of selectivity. The following statement, I found on the organizational website highlights the importance of selective membership: "Because Phi Kappa Phi is highly selective, membership is a stamp of academic excellence that is recognized by graduate and professional school admission committees and employers alike." This statement conveys the message that because Phi Kappa Phi is selective in terms of its membership, other institutions recognize its elitist nature.

By highlighting the selective nature of the organizational membership and the importance of selectivity, the organization is seeking the identification of its members by conveying the fact that membership is an exclusive privilege available to the chosen few. Specifically, joining Phi Kappa Phi automatically entitles one to an exclusive club membership that will enhance one's image in the eyes of the professional and the academic community. In short, the messages seem to imply that as a member in this exclusive club, one will stand out in the crowd. Closely tied to the strategy of portraying membership as an exclusive privilege, was the emphasis on organizational symbolism.

Emphasizing organizational symbolism

This identification strategy referred to the emphasis on the use of organizational symbols to instill a sense of organizational pride. Perusal of the organizational publications revealed there was a great emphasis on organizational symbolism. Members were encouraged through the organizational website, monthly e-mails, and *The Phi Kappa Phi Forum* to wear the Phi Kappa Phi regalia like the honor code, the medallion, the Phi Kappa tie, and the stole during graduation ceremonies.

The following message communicated on the organizational website bears testimony to the abovementioned fact: "It's not too late to order! Show your pride of affiliation by wearing one of our distinctive honor cords, stoles, or medallions at your commencement or other special academic ceremony." I also found a similar statement in the merchandise catalog section of The Phi Kappa Phi Forum. It said, "Show your pride of affiliation with The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi." These statements point out that the organization sought the identification of its members through the use of organizational symbols. The organization was trying to highlight the fact that Phi Kappa Phi regalia would make members stand out among peers during important events like graduation by communicating the message that they belong to an exclusive club of excellence. Thus, it was indirectly trying to instill a sense of organizational pride in the minds of the individual members.

Recognizing the individual as a symbol of excellence

In addition to portraying organizational membership as an exclusive privilege and emphasizing the use of organizational symbols, another evident identification strategy was the recognition of individual excellence. This identification strategy portrayed the individual as a symbol of excellence, in terms of academics and character, which made him or her eligible for the organizational membership. The organization seemed to convey the message that it has offered the

individual the membership primarily because of his or her individual excellence. The membership invite says, "You have earned this invitation because you are among the very best and brightest on your campus ---- not just in your chosen field of study, but from all academic disciplines." This statement conveys the message that the individual is noted for academic excellence in his or her college, and this has made him or her eligible for the organizational membership. Other statements that point to the same theme include the following: "Congratulations on having met our national eligibility requirements of both sound character and high academic achievement. The nation's oldest, largest, and most selective all-discipline honor society has recognized YOUR [*sic*] outstanding academic achievements." This statement highlights the fact that the individual has become eligible for membership primarily because of his or her excellence in academics and character.

All these statements point to an identification strategy that glorifies the individual as the epitome of excellence. The organization is portraying the individual as a symbol of excellence primarily because of his or her sound character and academic achievement. According to the society, this attribute of excellence has made the individual eligible to be a part of the organization. In addition to the organization's strategy of portraying the individual as an epitome of excellence was the closely related strategy of seeking identification through the celebration of member achievements.

Celebrating member achievements

This identification strategy referred to the recognition and celebration of member achievements. The organizational website published the following messages:

> "Three Phi Kappa Phi Members Named Rhodes Scholars (4/2/2008)"
> "Four Phi Kappa Phi Members Named 2008 Truman Scholars (4/2/2008)"
> "Twenty-Five Members Named 2008 Goldwater Scholars (4/1/2008)"
>
> Phi Kappa Phi members continue to make a name for themselves by earning valuable awards to help advance their education. Of the twenty-three graduate fellowships granted through Alpha Lambda Delta, four of the recipients are members of Phi Kappa Phi.

These statements point out that The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi is proud of its members, and by publishing their achievements in organizational publications, it is recognizing and celebrating their achievements. In fact, the organization actively pursues this identification strategy. For instance, every edition of the Phi Kappa Phi Forum carries the following message: "If you are an author and would like your work to be included in the 'Bookshelf' segment of *Member Focus*, please send a copy of the book along with a one page synopsis…" The Phi Kappa Phi Bookshelf, a part of the section highlighting member achievements in the *Phi Kappa Forum*, displays books written by members. The

Bookshelf carries a picture of the front cover of the book and a brief description of it.

Inviting member contributions

Another theme evident in the messages the organization communicated was the invitation for member contributions. This strategy involved seeking identification by trying to engage members with the organization. Members were encouraged to contribute articles and columns for the *Phi Kappa Phi Forum* and electronic publications. The e-mail newsletter, *Monthly Mentions*, carried the following advertisement:

> Looking for Fresh Perspectives: Forum Magazine Needs Members with the "Write" Stuff: At Phi Kappa Phi, we already know our members are both bright and talented. Now we're asking you, our members, to share your thoughts, insights, and expertise with your peers as a feature writer for the Phi Kappa Phi Forum magazine. You may have heard that the Forum is undergoing some changes. It's our hope that these changes -- a fresher presentation and more dynamic, thought-provoking content -- will enrich your Phi Kappa Phi membership. Currently we are seeking writers for the next two issues.

The above statements point out that the organization wishes to utilize the resources of its members and values their insights and opinions. Especially noticeable in this advertisement was the use of the phrase "*our members*." The organization was implying that it was seeking the skills and expertise of its highly valued and talented members. The organizational website also carried a similar advertisement for volunteers at its triennial conference:

> Every triennium we depend upon the good work of approximately 100 volunteers to serve on as many as fifteen national committees. Won't you please consider offering your services as a volunteer? Committee work usually involves conference telephone calls and one or more meetings at a central location. All travel expenses are paid for by the Society and meetings are kept to a minimum for the sake of efficiency. This is a wonderful opportunity to get involved on a national level with Phi Kappa Phi and to network with colleagues from around the country

Evident in these advertisements is the message that the organization wants its members to get involved with it. Thus, the organization's invitation for member contribution, in terms of articles and volunteer work, points to the notion that in spite of its low face-to-face member-contact nature, the organization values the skills and expertise of its members and seeks to utilize them. In addition, the organization is also trying to instill in the individual a sense of belongingness by inviting contributions, which has the potential to strengthen identification with the organization.

Emphasizing commitment to diversity

This identification strategy involved emphasizing that the organization values diversity by not discriminating on the basis of an individual's personal background and academic background. Many statements communicated by the organization emphasized the notion that the organization embraces diversity. For instance, the organizational website communicated the following messages:

> "Phi Kappa Phi does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, national origin, disability, gender, age, or sexual orientation."
> "Phi Kappa Phi Love of Learning Awards are equal opportunity scholarships."

These messages promote the feeling that irrespective of an individual's background, he or she is acceptable as a member of Phi Kappa Phi and is eligible for all member privileges. In addition, there was repeated mentioning of the phrase, "*all-discipline honor society,"* in many of the statements of the organizations. Thus, the strategy of portraying the organization as embracing diversity points to the fact that irrespective of an individual's academic or personal background, the society accepts him or her. Apart from these strategies, another strategy that was evident was the publishing of member testimonials.

Highlighting testimonials of appreciation

This strategy referred to the means of gaining identification by publishing testimonials of appreciation for the service offered by the organization and the testimonials of appreciation for the mission of the organization. The organizational website and other publications carried member testimonials. Each testimonial conveyed a member's unique perception about the organization. However, they all highlighted the theme of the members' appreciation of the organization. Some of them are as follows:

> Being a part of Phi Kappa Phi has meant a lot to me. Having someone recognize your hard work and achievements throughout college is a great reward. This organization promotes continuous learning and I think that it is a valuable life lesson.

This member views the organization as recognizing the achievements of its members and expresses appreciation for it. Another member said:

> I am extremely grateful for the generous award from Phi Kappa Phi. Without this fellowship, I doubt I would have made the decision to attend a private graduate school. At the time, I was very concerned about funding my education, and Phi Kappa Phi gave me the necessary support to realize my dreams.

In the eyes of this member, the organization was an aide in time of need. According to another member,

> With the help of Phi Kappa Phi, I was able to see and learn about another part of the world. Understanding the people and culture of Peru made me realize how much more to the world there is than just what I know in the United States.

For this member, the organization provided an opportunity for broadening his or her horizons. All the three testimonials were testimonials of appreciation for the services of the organization.
In addition, an issue of *The Forum* carried a presidential testimonial. The president of the society, Robert Rogow said:

> Carol and I are actively supporting the capital campaign because we strongly believe in the mission of The Honor society of Phi Kappa Phi and its recognition of our nation's academically superior students. The newly acquired Headquarters building in Baton Rouge will provide Phi Kappa Phi's superb staff with a befitting environment from which to enhance the society's mission in the years to come.

These statements reflect the president's endorsement and support of the mission of the organization. In fact, it reflects a theme of appreciation of the mission of the organization. Such statements could in turn stimulate similar endorsement and commitment on the part of the members. Specifically, publication of such statements could lead to symbolic convergence of members around common themes, which has the potential to enhance identification.

Thus, the organization used diverse strategies to gain the identification of its members. These strategies celebrated both the individual and the organization and tried to engage the individual actively with the organization. The organization portrayed the individual as a symbol of excellence and the organizational membership as the opportunity for celebrating that excellence. In a strategic manner, the organization portrayed itself as an exclusive club that admitted only the elite. In addition the organization, by publishing member testimonials of appreciation, seemed to be attempting to create symbolic convergence, which could lead to identification with the organization.

Discussion

Theoretical implications

This study sought to identify the strategies that a low face-to-face member-contact organization used to gain the identification of its members. The findings revealed the organization sought the identification of its members by portraying membership in the organization as an exclusive privilege, emphasizing organizational symbolism, recognizing the individual as a symbol of excellence, celebrating member achievements, inviting member contributions, emphasizing commitment to diversity, and highlighting testimonials of appreciation. Some of the specific identification strategies this organization used were similar to the identification strategies Cheney (1983a) found in the study of corporate house

organs. Specifically, the recognition accorded to individual achievements and the emphasis on organizational symbolism and testimonials were evident in Cheney's study.

In addition, the study also showed there was a great emphasis in portraying membership in the organization as an exclusive privilege and recognizing the individual member as a symbol of excellence. By portraying the individual as the epitome of excellence and the organizational membership as the opportunity for celebrating that excellence through exclusivity in membership, the organization was establishing a common ground with its members (Cheney, 1983a). In other words, the organization was establishing a common ground with its members by portraying both the individual and the organization as elitist. Elitism as a common-ground strategy has the potential to enhance the attractiveness of the organizational identity, distinctiveness of the organizational image, consistency between the individual identity and the organizational identity, perception of organizational image as enhancing self-esteem, and attractiveness of the external image of the organization. These factors strengthen organizational identification (Dutton et al., 1994). The flavor of elitism also resounded in the identification strategies of organizational symbolism and celebrating member achievements. Thus, elitism was an overarching theme that resounded across multiple identification strategies that the organization used.

Elitism as a strategy is very important, especially in view of the low face-to-face member-contact nature of the organization. However, one could also raise the argument that the organization is prone to using this strategy because the criterion for member selection is based on elite academic standards; but the important aspect is the manner in which the messages of elitism are constructed. Specifically, the way the organization positions the individual relative to itself. The explicit acknowledgement that the individual and the organization are both elitist, through the emphasis on membership as an exclusive privilege and the recognition of the individual as a symbol of excellence, is in a sense conveying the message that both the individual and the organization are located on the same plane. This could be extremely beneficial to the organization as it has the potential to boost the ego of the individual. By pandering the ego of the individual in such a manner, the organization is attempting to overcome the barriers posed by the lack of face-to-face interactions, and sustain and enhance identification. Thus, the nature of organizing seems to have led the organization to use the strategy that reflected notions of elitism in a manner that emphasized its uniqueness and positioned the individual and itself on the same plane. This in turn points to the fact that the nature of organizing may be a major factor that determines the kind of identification strategies that an organization may adopt.

Previous studies have shown the perception of organizational membership as elitist can create a sense of identification in the minds of the members. For instance, Bourassa and Ashforth's (1998) study revealed the elimination of crewmembers who could not survive the harsh conditions in the trawler inspired an elitist feeling in the minds of the survivors, which advanced their initiation into the culture of the ship, and consequently, their sense of identification. In the case of Phi Kappa Phi too, a similar strategy seems to be operating. The sense of

elitism created as a result of being one of the chosen few could lead to a sense of identification with the organization. Creating a dichotomy between members and nonmembers in such a manner can create identities defined by the perception of elitism and prestige that makes members stand apart from nonmembers. This has the potential to enhance identification.

However, the message of elitism is communicated mainly through a mediated environment. The mediated environment in the form of organizational websites and publications is the prime interface between the organization and the individual, and the organization by communicating its identification strategies through the mediated environment is trying to create an imagined sense of organizational belongingness. In other words, the organization, through the mediated environment, is attempting to socialize its members and hence, create a sense of identification. Specifically, the organization is attempting to create an identity structure for the individual through a one-sided mediated communication. Future research should look at whether this strategy pays dividends for the organization in terms of securing the identification of the members. This is important because, as mentioned previously, the use of mediated communication technologies could result in reduced levels of attachment among organizational members because of one-way information sharing and limited interactivity (Scott, 2001). Furthermore, research has also shown that multiple entities compete for an individual's sense of identification (Hughes & Ahearne, 2010; Scott, 1997, 2007). Hence, understanding the efficacy of identification strategies communicated primarily through mediated channels is important.

Areas of Future Research

In this context, it would also be interesting to explore how individual members view the organization and their role as organizational members. Hence, future studies should explore the organizational identification of the members of the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. Such a study would reveal the persuasive efficacy of the identification strategies of a low face-to-face member-contact organization. Specifically, such a study would reveal whether the identification messages celebrating the individual and the organization primarily through a mediated environment are effective in terms of gaining the identification of individual members. This would reveal in turn whether members socially identify with the organization and consequently, exhibit behaviors that reveal organizational commitment, support and loyalty (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Studies have shown identification is a complex process and that the nature of social interactions plays a major role in creating the sense of identification. Pratt (2000) found socialization through effective social interactions led to the divesture of the original identities of new Amway members and the creation of new identities that displayed positive identification with the organization. In contrast, less effective social interactions led to feelings of deidentification (perception of no connection with the organization) and disidentification (feelings of hostility toward the organization). Hence, it would be interesting to explore whether communication of identification seeking messages primarily through a mediated environment and lack of opportunities for social interactions results in a sense of

identification, deidentification or disidentification with the organization. This would reveal in turn whether social interactions, especially face-to-face interactions, are a prerequisite for creating a sense of organizational identification.

In addition, future studies should also look for messages that may have the potential for disidentification with the organization. Specifically, future research could look at how the presence of such messages, in addition to identification seeking messages, could influence the extent to which individuals identify with the organization. Moreover, in view of the fact that the nature of organizing may be a major factor that determines the kind of identification strategies that an organization may adopt, future research could also identify other unconventional forms of organizing and examine their identification strategies. This could strengthen the fact that the nature of organizing is indeed the determining factor in decisions regarding the choice of identification strategies.

Other avenues for future research include exploring whether the identification strategy of attempting to create symbolic convergence through the publication of member testimonials is creating an imagined sense of community and consequently, feelings of organizational identification. According to the Bormann's symbolic convergence theory (1985, 1986), symbolic convergence emerges through the sharing of fantasies. Bormann (1985) defined fantasy as "the creative and imaginative shared interpretation of events that fulfills a group's psychological or rhetorical needs" (p. 130). The sharing of fantasies, according to Bormann, results in group identification and a feeling of community.

It would also be interesting to look at organizational identification strategies of an organization at different periods in its life. This in turn would reveal changes in organizational identification strategies prompted by organizational and environmental changes and organizational changes prompted by the need for enhancing the identification of members. In the case of The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi, it would be interesting to explore the organizational identification strategies it pursued since its inception. The main limitation of this study is that apart from the organizational website, it examined only publications between fall 2006 and spring 2008. A better understanding of the identification strategies requires an examination of organizational communications published during other periods. Moreover, a report of the president of the organization reveals the organization has changed its bylaws to permit more student participation in its affairs effective from 2010 (Rogow, 2007). After more than a century since its inception, why is the organization undertaking such a major organizational change? Is it sensing a lack of identification on the part of its student members? Future studies should look at exploring these areas.

Thus, the study has revealed interesting areas of future research that would enhance the breadth and depth of organizational identification literature. Specifically, in future studies, the linking together of organizational identification strategies and the consequences of those strategies on the identification of members with the organization, could lead to the generation of context-specific knowledge in the area of organizational identification. Studies have mainly used standardized questionnaires. These instruments do not make any reference to

context-specific identification messages. This has led to loss of valuable insights pertaining to organizational identification as the inquiry processes have been de-contextualized, making it difficult for the respondents to provide information regarding the nature of their identification.

Conclusion

The study, by exploring the identification strategies of a low face-to-face member-contact organization, has raised interesting issues that have the potential to guide inquiry in the future. It has pointed to the fact that nature of organizing may lead to the adoption of unique identification strategies and that the manner in which identification-seeking messages are constructed may enhance the identification strategy that is employed. The identification seeking messages were communicated through mediated forms of communication. This strategy of communicating identification-seeking messages through a one-sided mediated form of communication raises an important area of inquiry that needs to be undertaken considering the current pervasiveness and importance of technology in organizing. Specifically, there exists the need to explore the impact of the communication of identification seeking messages primarily through a mediated environment on individuals' sense of identification with the organization. Findings of such a form of inquiry could have implications for mediated forms of organizing, in general, as more and more organizations are creating mediated organizational structures as a cost-cutting strategy and as a means to overcome the barriers posed by time and space. Hence, it is pertinent that organizational identification in the context of low face-to-face member-contact organizations be explored, considering the strategic importance of mediated communication for present day organizations.

References

Adler, B. J. (1995). Building and maintaining church identity: Rhetorical strategies found in letters from two Lutheran leaders. *Journal of Communication & Religion, 18,* 29-39.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 20-39.

Bartels, J., Pruyn, A., de Jong, M., & Joustra, I. (2007). Multiple organizational identification levels and the impact of perceived external prestige and communication climate. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*, 173-190.

Bhattacharya, C. B., Rao, H., & Glynn, M. A. (1995). Understanding the bond of identification: An investigation of its correlates among art museum members. *Journal of Marketing, 59*, 46-57.

Bormann, E. G. (1985). Symbolic convergence theory: A communication formulation. *Journal of Communication, 35*, 128-138.

Bormann, E. G. (1986). Symbolic convergence theory and communication in group decision-making. In R. Y. Hirokawa & M. S. Poole (Eds.) , *Communication and group decision making* (pp. 219-236). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Bourassa, L., & Ashforth, B. E. (1998). You are about to party in defiant style: Socialization and identity onboard an Alaskan fishing boat. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 27,* 171-196.

Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cheney, G. (1983a). The rhetoric of identification and study of organizational communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 69,* 143-158.

Cheney, G. (1983b). On the various and changing meanings of organizational membership: A field study of organizational identification. *Communication Monographs, 50,* 342-362.

Connaughton, S. L. & Jarvis, S. E. (2004). Apolitical politics: GOP efforts to foster identification from Latinos, 1984-2000. *Communication Studies, 55,* 464-480.

Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39,* 239-263.

Driskill, G., & Camp, J. W. (2006). Identification strategies for unity: A study of a unity movement among Christian church organizations. *Journal of Communication and Religion, 29,* 445-483.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social identity and self categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review, 25,* 121-140.

Hughes, D.E., & Ahearne, M. (2010). Energizing the reseller's sales force: The power of

brand identification. *Journal of Marketing, 74,* 81-96.

Phi Kappa Phi (2005-2006). Annual Report. Retrieved from http://www.phikappaphi.org/Web/Publications/annual_reports.html

Pratt, M. G. (2000). The good, the bad, and the ambivalent: Managing identification among Amway distributors. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 45,* 456-493.

Owen, W. F. (1984). Interpretive themes in relational communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70,* 274-287.

Rogow, R. B. (2007, Fall). President's page. *Phi Kappa Phi Forum, 87(4).*

Scott, C. R. (1997). Identification with multiple targets in a geographically dispersed organization. *Management communication Quarterly, 10,* 491-522.

Scott, C. R. (2001). Establishing and maintaining customer loyalty and employee identification

in the new economy: A communicative response. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14,* 629-636.

Scott, C. R. (2007). Communication and social identity theory: Existing and potential connections in organizational identification research. *Communication Studies, 58,* 123-138.

Scott, C. R., Corman, S. R., & Cheney, G. (1998). Development of a structurational model of identification in the organization. *Communication Theory, 8,* 298-336.

Simon, H. A. (1977). *Administrative behavior: A study of the decision-making processes in administrative organizations (4th ed.)*. New York: The Free Press.

Smidts, A., Pruyn, A. T. H., & Van Riel, C. B. M. (2001). The impact of employee communication and perceived external prestige on organizational identification. *Academy of Management Journal*, *44*, 1051–1062.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In. S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.phikappaphi.org/Web/index.html

Tompkins, P. K., & Cheney, G. (1983). Account analysis of organizations: Decision-making and identification. In L. Putnam & M. Pacanowsky (Eds.), *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp. 126-146). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Van Dick, R., Grojean, M. W., Christ, O., & Wieseke, J. (2006). Identity and the extra mile: Relationships between organizational identification and organizational citizenship behavior. *British Journal of Management*, *17*, 283–301.

Van Knippenberg, D. & Sleebos, E. (2006).Organizational identification versus organizational commitment: Self-definition, social exchange, and job attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *27*, 571–84.

Vaughn, M. A. (1997). Organizational identification strategies and values in high technology industries: A rhetorical-organizational approach to the analysis of socialization processes in corporate discourse. *Journal of Public Relations*, *9*, 119-139.

Late Husserl for the Rhetorical Critic

J. Scott Andrews
Pennsylvania State University

Abstract

Questions of objectivity are perennial concerns of rhetorical critics—whether it is attainable, what form it takes, and how generally its results may be held. Given the celebrated "particularity" of any given rhetorical act, "objectivity" in rhetorical criticism is generally inadmissible as a standard for evaluation. The most frequent response to such questions is to assume a relativistic critical stance. Another alternative is to take a phenomenological approach—to let "the things" speak for "themselves." This approach has taken root in communication studies, but less so in rhetorical criticism, given the (false) dilemma that the objectivity-subjectivity dichotomy forces. Edmund Husserl, in his last works, suggests the real decision lies between "ideal" and genuine objectivity. This study, then, offers up this choice, and proposes—by examining Husserl's later concepts, method, and extensions—that rhetorical critics can, and perhaps should, seek genuine objectivity.

Key words: Husserl, phenomenology, rhetorical criticism, science, history, language

Introduction

"No ideas but in things."
~William Carlos Williams

"Zurück zu den *Sachen selbst*!" [Return to the things themselves!]
~Edmund Husserl

In the past 15 years or so, a number of communications scholars—a small handful of rhetorical critics among them—have taken a phenomenological approach to observed "phenomena," armed with the vague call to action to account for "the things themselves" without the aid of theory, scientific or otherwise. Understood, per the founder of phenomenology, Edmund Husserl (1970a), as an "inquiry back into the ground of" any given phenomenon, "to look open the obvious as questionable," or, for Derrida, "to cut a path to what is already supposed," phenomenology has benefitted both broad, contemporary areas of inquiry as well as the disclosure of individual phenomena (p. 175, 180; Derrida, 1978, p. 121). Phenomena most apparent in "the world" of women's studies (Campbell, 2004; Fish, 1976; Hua, 2009; Isa, 2000; Sundén, 2001; Suter, 2004; Thompson, et al., 1990), queer studies (Ashford, 2006; Horncastle, 2009; Lindholm, 1998; Weeks, 1998; Weiss, 2005; Young, 2004), and race studies (Halone, 2008; Haritaworn, 2009; Jackson, 1998; Martinez, 2006; McPhail, 1996), to cite only the broadest fields, have all been the object of phenomenological critiques.

Even within the field of rhetoric, a small, sometimes exclusive variety of phenomenological approaches have been rendered as a meta-critic. Lanigan, from this perspective suggests (for example) that in traditional situational criticism, "one gains a conception (a sedimentation) of a situation, but not a perception of the value constituents that constitute the primordial act of speaking with intent" (1969, p. 64). That is, we may have *rhetorical history* but not *rhetorical criticism*, a distinction of value for the rhetorical critic. Other prominent rhetorical scholars, too—namely Gregg, Aune, Rosenfield, and Blair recommend phenomenological approaches to rhetorical criticism, that, we shall see, ultimately fall short of Husserl's original intention.

Gregg (1966) takes the view of the *psychologist* that "behavior is not so much a function of an external event as it is a product of the individual's perception of the event" (p. 83). In recommending a *phenomenological psychology* for rhetorical criticism, Gregg looks to a rhetor's cognitive structure as an intellectual and symbolic ordering and as the basis for his or her actions. It is not clear if Husserl ever came to terms with psychology, but it is clear that Gregg's approach brackets out the world of others. Lanigan takes the view of the *existentialist* who sees *self* in terms of the *world*, whereas it is clear Husserl reversed these. For Lanigan, a rhetor "constitutes a phenomenon wherein meaning is "bracketed" within a *Gestalt*." This, a rhetorical act, calls a rhetorical situation into being, effectively reversing Bitzer's original conception (1969, p. 61). Aune (1981) takes the view of the *hermeneuticist*, settling for "a description of the sedimentations involved in an initial encounter with the statement, a 'making strange' of the statement through free variation in the imagination, and, finally a search for invariant structures that appear through the process of free variation" (p. 102). There is textual evidence in Husserl to suggest that this is not inappropriate: "The horizon-exposition to which we recurred must not bog down in vague, superficial talk; it must itself arrive at its own sort of scientific discipline. The sentences in which it is expressed must be fixed and capable of being made self-evident again and again" (Husserl, 1970b, p. 374). That is to say, *add reason* and Aune's approach becomes Husserlian. Rosenfield (1974) takes the view of the *aestheticist*, preferring to "release himself, letting the phenomena 'speak to him' through their luminosity" (p. 494-495). Rhetorical criticism here would take shape as an appreciation of "expression[s] of the human spirit," and thus probably be more accurately called literary criticism.

Blair (1981), finally, does not so much suggest a new method for criticism as to provide us with a simple way to conceive—in Husserl's terms—the range of rhetorical criticism. Starting from an early Husserlian conception of three ways of intending—being conscious of—an object (presentation, judgment, feeling), Blair shows us how the psychologist, existentialist, hermeneuticist, and aestheticist essentially overemphasize one of these *intentionalities*. That being said, Gregg's critical method looks to "that which is the object of feeling and judgment. . . . the content of the phenomenon," and so emphasizes a rhetor's *presentational intentionality*, while Rosenfield "appreciates" the aesthetic givenness, or feeling, of a phenomenon—its *affective intentionality* (Blair, 1981, p. 56). What Blair argues is that these phenomenological approaches to rhetori-

cal criticism are incomplete: they all overlook a "final mode of intentionality" namely, evaluation. The Husserlian approach to which Blair refers and this study recommends incorporates at once all four of these intentionalities.

There is nothing inherently wrong with these recent critical treatments, but each one brings with it not only its own method, but also its own set of presuppositions. The first fault is benign—after all, phenomenology is a methodology, not a method. The second fault is probably also benign, presuming that one had indeed returned to the "things themselves." But Husserl, late in life, was able to observe how his early phenomenology was being utilized and metamorphosed by his former students Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, Gadamer, and Arendt, among others, and sought to refine his original idea. Against existential phenomenology, for example, which seeks to disclose the things themselves in terms of total subjectivity, Husserl (1970a) asks, "Is its irrationality not finally rather a narrow-minded and bad rationality, worse than that of the old rationalism?" (p. 16) Does not even the subjective approach presume at least one ideally objective fact—namely, universal subjectivity, or relativity? Beyond this, Derrida (1978) points out:

> there is another naiveté just as serious, but with a more modern style: naiveté of profundity or depth and not of superficiality, it consists in redescending toward the prescientific perception without making problematic . . . continually keep[ing] alive the *question: how can the a priori of scientific Objectivity be constituted starting from those of the life-world?* Without this question, any return, however penetrating, risks abdicating all scientific quality *in general* and all philosophical dignity . . . we see to what irresponsible empiricism all the 'phenomenologies' of prescientific perception are condemned, phenomenologies which would not let themselves be beset by that question. (p. 120)

Phenomenology for Husserl was from the start intended to be a "rigorous science," and thus he sought in his fourth "Introduction to Phenomenology"—after *Ideas* (1913), *Formal and Transcendental Logic* (1929), and *Cartesian Meditations* (1931)—his final, unfinished work *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology* (1937)—to give his own definitive statement. As *The Crisis* took shape, Husserl "repeatedly designated this series of essays as the crowning achievement of his life's work," according to another student of his, Schutz (Husserl, 1970a, p. xxix).

Prolific as he was, Husserl is nonetheless notoriously difficult to read in translation. If this study accomplishes nothing else, it aims to make accessible to rhetoricians (and communications scholars broadly) a précis of Husserl's "definitive" late phenomenology—its fundamental concepts, moves, and implications. Along the way, its relevance to the rhetorical critic will be made clear. Because he is wont to teach his phenomenology as he constructs it, this study can only do the same. The reader is asked for a bit of "teleological" indulgence.

Husserl's Late Phenomenology

When Husserl set out late in life in search of "The Origin of Geometry," he came to a striking conclusion, one most rhetoricians today take for granted. To the primary question "[H]ow does geometrical ideality (just like that of all sciences) proceed from its primary intrapersonal origin, where it is a structure within the conscious space of the first inventor's soul, to its ideal objectivity?," Husserl answered that "In advance we see that it occurs by means of language, through which it receives, so to speak, its linguistic living body [*Sprachleib*]" (1970b, p. 357-358). In coming to this conclusion, Husserl hit upon not only the rhetorical basis of the sciences, but the rhetorical fundament of all human institutions. His simple answer is misleading, though, presupposing in one premise what will take him all of *The Crisis* (and supplementary texts) to make self-evident: The geometer (nor, presumably, the reader) does not see this "in advance"—and herein lies the crisis.

Focused as it is on its forward development, all of science has come to "speak" a shared, efficient, self-sufficient language. Logic, understood by scientists as "the universal, a priori, fundamental science for all objective sciences," is, for Husserl (1970b), "nothing but naiveté" in that "out of sentences with sedimented signification, logical 'dealing' can produce only other // sentences of the same character" (p. 365-366). Logical constructions have, from the start, lacked a full grounding in original self-evidence, and without this, any one logical construction "hangs in mid-air, without support" (Husserl, 1970a, p. 141). Self-evidence, for Husserl, "means nothing more than grasping an entity with the consciousness of its original being-itself-there [*Selbst-da*]. Successful realization of a project is, for the acting subject, self-evidence; in this self-evidence, what has been realized is there, *originaliter*, as itself" (1970b, p. 356). Logic, in leaving behind this original self-evidence, by implication leaves behind a part, however small, of the world—namely, the past "present" and the people living in it. Restricted by an internal language and negligent of large swaths of the world, science as it is practiced cannot attain its goal (*telos*) of genuine objectivity, understood by Husserl (1970c) as "that which is—for *all conceivable* civilizations (including Papuans), [for all] experiences, [all] surrounding worlds, which are assumed to be experiencing the same things" (p. 321). To the extent that this is so, "objectivity," as scientists and most of us understand it, is an ideal objectivity—its "facts" are no more valid than any other particular "cultural facts."

"The Crisis of European Sciences" is the same today as it was in Husserl's 1930s: the products of scientific inquiry, despite their "ideal" status in the world, fall short of their "objective" claim to the total world. Science can not answer some of the most important, human questions. Can rhetoricians better answer these questions, as Husserl seems to indicate? Can the rhetorical critic make objective claims which hold for the total world? Can the claims of a rhetor be critiqued or judged against any objective standard? What follows describes two misguided "ideals" and how through Husserl's late phenomenology, "the things themselves" can be understood genuinely objectively.

Scientific "Objectivity" and the A Priori of the Life-World

If anything in the world is to be held, per Husserl's definition, as genuinely "objective"—and not merely ideally so, as in the sciences, one will have to transcend the naiveté of the scientific (logical-theoretical) purview and return, as it were, to the original naiveté of the life-world—the world in which we normally, straightforwardly live—to find it. To return to an original, prescientific naiveté is not a simple matter—it requires, in fact, a complete change of attitude. This change takes place through what Husserl (1970a) calls an *epoche*: "a withholding of natural, naïve validities and in general of validities already in effect" (p. 135). With respect to science, this means that the phenomenologist avoids "all participation" in the scientist's paradigms, interests, aims, and activities. Rather, through the *epoche*, the phenomenologist adopts the "natural" attitude of normal living in the pregiven world—for all of us, including scientists, "the world."

In this "natural," pregiven world, we all "move in a current of ever new experiences, judgments, valuations, decisions" (Husserl, 1970a, p. 144). Here is found all of our goals and ends, of which the scientific goal of "objectivity" is but a part. It is true that all human interests—"all theoretical and practical goals taken as themes—as existing, as perhaps existing, as probable, as questionable, as valuable, as project, as action and result of action"—are directed towards objects in the world, and obviously this is the case in science (1970a, p. 149). Nevertheless, in the natural attitude, we are normally satisfied to base and judge our decisions and actions in "validity," rather than (scientific) objectivity. "Everything becomes perfectly clear" in the epoche of the objective sciences, says Husserl (1970c), "when we say to ourselves, or each of us says to himself: the world of which I speak, the world of which the Chinese speaks, of which the Greek of Solon's time, the Papuan speaks, is always *a world having subjective validity*, even the world of the scientist, who as such is a Greek-European man" (p. 325; my italics).

"Factual" History and the A Priori of History

With the last clause, Husserl introduces to his phenomenology the problem of history. The scientist, "a Greek-European man," is himself a product and producer of history (and, as such, a man). The validities which the scientist produces in his forward advance necessarily presuppose the work and validities proffered by scientists before him on which the latter scientist will build. The latest scientific advance implicitly brings with it all the science of the past, which in its time was the latest scientific advance. In fact, everything that "exists in its essential being as tradition and handing-down" presupposes this a priori of history (Husserl, 1970b, p. 372). For Husserl, this includes "any given cultural fact" (e.g., science, geometry) and in toto, the "whole cultural world, in all its forms" (p. 354). All cultural facts, or phenomena, are ideal objects—are constituted historically from earlier, sedimented cultural facts, and these, in turn become the "working materials" for cultural facts to come (p. 369). This phenomenon allows Husserl to redefine history as "from the start nothing other than the

vital movement of the coexistence and the interweaving of original formations and sedimentations of meaning" (p. 371).

For the rhetorical critic who regularly deals in cultural facts, formations, and meanings, this means that to understand any one phenomenon—in full self-evidence—is "to be conscious of its historicity'' (Husserl, 1970b, p.370). A phenomenon's historicity is not the same as its "history," in the traditional sense. "History" as a field of study presumes to issue in "objectivity" as much as science, and when it behaves as a science, stakes its claims too on formerly valid, now taken-for-granted, "facts." Historicism particularly and "factual histories" generally fail to achieve their goal of (genuine) "objectivity," insofar as their proponents presuppose many "facts" that in the past could not have been be held genuinely objectively. The parts of "the world" which lied outside the past historian's purview remain outside—even implicitly—the present historian's gaze, no matter how much the contemporary historian may verify against state-of-the-art standards of "historical objectivity."

Historicity, on the other hand, encompasses—or, better—constitutes all "histories." If we take seriously Husserl's definition of history (above), historicity becomes that which constitutes "the whole sphere of absolute ideal Objectivity and all the eidetic sciences" (Derrida, 1978, p. 121). Just as all "sciences" practiced today have this historicity, our latest "histories" share this essence, too. Like "geometry", any one of today's "historical sciences" ("schools") achieves no more than an ideal objectivity. Like "geometry," "history" today is itself a cultural fact as it produces cultural facts; like geometry, it and its products can be studied as a phenomenon by rhetorical critics. What this means, however, is that if the rhetorician aspires to genuine objectivity, he or she can not turn to any of the methods and concepts of "science" or of "history" as it is practiced. Husserl suggests the critic must somehow "strike through the crust of the externalized 'historical facts' of philosophical history, interrogating, exhibiting, and testing their inner meaning and hidden teleology" (1970a, p. 18). What is required once more is an epoche, this time of "factual history" (or "history").

Back in the natural world—the "prehistoric" world if you will—we realize everything—all people, acts, and ends—are thoroughly historical, but not necessarily "as if the temporal becoming in which we ourselves have evolved were merely an external causal series" (Husserl, 1970a, p. 71). To be genuinely objective, history must be able to give an account of "the essentially general structure lying in our present and then in every past or future historical present as such" (Husserl, 1970b, p. 372). Because "only in the final establishment is this revealed," Husserl recommends a "teleological" approach to history (1970a, p. 73). (This is the overall method of *The Crisis* (Parts I and II), and "The Origin of Geometry," as will be illustrated in the next part of this study). History made in this manner starts with what is, as a phenomenon to be made self-evident. Self-evidence can come only from "a critical over-all view which brings to light, behind 'historical facts' of documented philosophical theories and their apparent oppositions and parallels, a meaningful, final harmony" (1970a, p. 73). The benefit that accrues to rhetorical critics who take this view is that any critical claim established in this way (i.e., that accounts for present as much as the past) "can

never be decisively refuted by citing the documented 'personal testimony' [subjective validity] of earlier philosophers" (1970a, p. 73). This view is, once more, the natural attitude.

Genuine Objectivity

In the natural attitude, then, (after the epoche of the objective sciences and the epoche of factual history), "the world" is not only *a world having subjective validity*, for me and then for us, but also *a world having historicity*, wherein everything (all people, acts, and ends) are thoroughly historical. These characterizations Husserl calls, respectively, the "a priori of the life-world" and the "a priori of history." For the rhetorical critic, or any investigator, these may be taken as two "healthy" presuppositions on which genuinely objective critical statements may be based. Admittedly, these a priori are already "taken for granted" by most rhetoricians, and taken alone, do not immediately suggest how to proceed making such statements. To what, if not "science" or "history," does the critic turn?

These a priori do, however, suggest the radical generality required for a truly objective critical stance—one that is valid for the total world, present, past, and future. For many rhetorical critics, this forces a decision of priority, between the (celebrated) particularity of rhetorical acts and critical objectivity. Only each critic may decide which to emphasize. Husserl, for his part, endorses the latter, and for those who choose to follow this sort of phenomenological approach, he shows the way he has taken to reach this goal. In the next part of this study, I will illuminate his path with a map and a synoptic illustration. In the part following, I will draw from this critical example—an act of rhetorical criticism in its own right—implications and future directions for the phenomenological rhetorical critic.

Husserl's Late Method

Recall that the phenomenon Husserl critiques in *The Crisis* is "ideal objectivity" in science. Two central questions essentially frame his inquiry: (1) How has original, genuine objectivity become, in science, "idealized?", and (2) Can we re-attain the original sense of genuine objectivity?

The second question is, in fact, the fundamental question asked in all phenomenological inquiry: How can any object, or phenomenon, be made present and self-evident? Already in *The Crisis*, Husserl has, through the epoche of factual history and the epoche of objective science, respectively, disclosed two a priori that comprised the "original" present sense of objectivity and that, moving forward, should form the basis of genuine objectivity. Is this not also the fundamental question asked by the rhetor as he or she conceives a rhetoric: How can this idea of mine be made present and self-evident to my hearers (watchers, readers, etc.)? The first question shapes the majority of *The Crisis*, but its pertinence too should not be lost on rhetorical critics. Many of our critical questions take this same form: How has any particular cultural object become ideal—shared or sharable, communicated or communicable? What "in any given [cultural] situation [are] the available means of persuasion?"

In "The Origin of Geometry," synopsized below, Husserl answers both questions in one act. In so doing, he performs, unbeknownst to him, an act of rhetorical criticism. For the benefit of the rhetorical critic, what follows is, in Husserl's own estimation, "exemplary" of his last, definitive phenomenological method. In the passage that leads, from *The Crisis*, Husserl (1970a) describes his own method for achieving genuine objectivity—for making present and self-evident—about philosophy. Given now the a priori of the life-world and the a priori of history, it is both easy and appropriate for the rhetorical critic to substitute for "philosophy" the name of any phenomenon:

> What is clearly necessary . . . is that we *reflect back*, in a thorough *historical* and *critical* fashion in order to provide, *before all decisions*, for a radical self-understanding: we must inquire back into what was originally and always sought in philosophy, what was continually sought by all the philosophers and philosophies that have communicated with one another historically; but this must include a critical [judgmental] consideration of what, in respect to the goals and methods [of philosophy], is ultimate, original, and genuine and which, once seen, apodictically conquers the will. (p. 17-18; his italics)

Synopsis of "The Origin of Geometry" (Husserl, 1970b)

1. "Science," like "[e]very spiritual accomplishment," necessarily must have a beginning: "first as a project and then in successful execution" (p. 356);

2. The goal of science, "objectivity," was established by "mathematizing" the objects found in nature;

3. As such, it bases all of its validities ("facts") on this "geometrization";

4. To understand the "original motivation and movement of thought which led to the conceiving" of this idealization of nature, we must "inquire back into the original meaning of the handed-down geometry, which continued to be valid with this very same meaning—continued and at the same time was developed further, remaining simply "geometry" in all its new forms" (p. 353);

5. Galileo is the "consummating discoverer" of this idea; with him, it "appears for the first time, so to speak, as full-blown" (Husserl, 1970a, p. 52, 57);

6. Whatever in his surrounding world—formally or materially—motivated him to conceive "geometry" serves also as the phenomenological basis for all later "objectivity." Whatever this is must have been self-evident to him. (Most likely, much was implicitly taken-for-granted by him. It falls to the phenomenologist to "unearth" what is tacitly presupposed.);

7. The "most obvious [material] commonplaces" Galileo "had at his disposal. . . that which must have served as the material for his generalizations" would have included at least space-time, shapes, figures, corporeality, motion, deformation, measuring, preferred shapes, smoothing, perfection. (These too are "objects," and may, in fact, prescribe a whole other phenomenological investigation.) (1970b, p. 376);

8. These objects, in order to be generalizable, to exhibit "objectivity," must have been made "ideal objects," capable of outliving its discoverer as part of "the inner historicity of the individuals" (p. 372). That is, a continuity from one person to another, from one time to another, must have been capable of being carried out. It is clear that the method of producing original idealities out of what is prescientifically given in the cultural world must have been written down and fixed in firm sentences prior to the existence of geometry; furthermore, the capacity for translating these sentences from vague [passive] linguistic understanding into the clarity of the reactivation of their self-evident meaning must have been, in its own way, handed down and ever capable of being handed down. (1970b, p. 365)

9. Documentation—the capacity to inscribe—of these ideal objects makes their communication possible from person-to-person, and across time (pp. 360-361). In the documenting, what would have been originally self-evident to Galileo is substituted by words, symbols, and figures—an efficient "language" for the total geometrical structure: How the living tradition of the meaning-formation of elementary concepts is actually carried on can be seen in elementary geometrical instruction and its textbooks; what we actually learn there is how to deal with ready-made concepts and sentences in a rigorously methodical way. Rendering the concepts sensibly intuitable by means of drawn figures is substituted for the production of the primal idealities. (p. 365);

10. This efficiency, and the "extraordinarily far-reaching practical usefulness became of itself a major motive for the advancement and appreciation of these sciences" (p. 369). As more and more ideal objects began to encompass and extend "the world," the original self-evidence, sedimented by language, and then later merely presumed, "made itself felt so little" that it was completely lost—not present—if only temporarily;

11. In not accounting for the original self-evidence, at least part of the historical world and the persons living in it, persons have been unaccounted for. Thus original, genuine "objectivity"—valid for all conceivable people, present, past and future—became for all sciences, merely "ideal objectivity" or "ideality" (pp. 365-366).

From this brief account, we can now understand *historically* how one phenomenon, geometry and by implication, all of science, has historically achieved

it "ideal objectivity," or what we commonly reference as "objectivity." *Critically*, we know now why this "ideal objectivity" falls short of science's original goal—genuine objectivity. For rhetorical critics interested in the phenomenological approach, "The Origin of Geometry" offers at least an exemplar of Husserl's method—of the epoche, for example. Better, it demonstrates this having already incorporated the a priori of the life-world and the a priori of history—that is, from within the natural attitude.

Extensions of Husserl's Late Phenomenology

Beyond its exemplary function, Husserl's approach to "The Origin of Geometry" can be extended in any number of directions. Any one of the steps enumerated above, for example, can serve as launching points for an entirely new phenomenological inquiry, to be conducted in the same, iterable fashion. In this sense, phenomenological inquiry is open—never really "finished." "[A]n infinity of ever new phenomena" may be disclosed—

> an infinity because continued penetration shows that every phenomenon attained through this unfolding of meaning, given at first in the life-world as obviously existing, itself contains meaning- and validity-implications whose exposition leads again to new phenomena, and so on. . . . just as any newly developed form [of meaning] is destined to become material, namely, to function in the constitution of [some new] form. (Husserl, 1970a, p. 112)

In addition, because "a whole class of spiritual products of the cultural world" enjoy the same "ideal objectivity" (as evidenced above in the range of phenomenon discussed in the literature review above), any one of this class of cultural phenomena can be examined in this manner. Because language is the fundament of this "ideal objectivity"—is how any such phenomenon is idealized, validated across subjects, communalized, this phenomenology can be comfortable conducted from within a rhetorical perspective. Finally, because "language itself, in all its particularizations (words, sentences, speeches), is, as can easily be seen from the grammatical point of view, thoroughly made up of ideal objects," we not only begin to understand Kenneth Burke's motive in the *Grammar*, but we are also and ultimately enjoined to disclose the phenomenon "rhetoric" (Husserl, 1970b, p. 357).

References

Aune, J. (1981). A phenomenology of rhetorical utterance. In S. Deetz (Ed.), *Phenomenology in Rhetoric and Communication* (pp. 101-108). Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Blair, C. (1981). Toward a phenomenological perspective for rhetorical criticism. In S. Deetz (Ed.), *Phenomenology in Rhetoric and Communication* (pp. 51-58). Washington DC: University Press of America.

Ashford, C. (2006). The only gay in the village: Sexuality and the net. *Information & Communications Technology Law, 15*, 275-289.

Campbell, M. (2004). 'Go White Girl!': Hip hop booty dancing and the white female body. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies, 18,* 497-508.

Derrida, J. (1978). *Edmund Husserl's "Origin of Geometry:" An introduction*. (J. Leavey, Jr., Trans.). Stony Brook, NY: N. Hays.

Fish, S. L. (1976). A phenomenological examination of femininity. *Journal of Applied Communications Research, 4,* 43-53.

Gregg, R. (1966). A phenomenologically oriented approach to rhetorical criticism. *Central States Speech Journal, 17,* 83-90.

Halone, K. K. (2008). The structuration of racialized sport organizing. *Journal of Communication Inquiry, 32,* 22-42.

Haritaworn, J. (2009). 'Caucasian and Thai make a good mix': Gender, ambivalence and the 'mixed-race' body. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 12,* 59-78.

Horncastle, J. (2009). Queer orientation: Selfhood and poetics. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies, 23,* 903-920.

Husserl, E. (1970a). *The crisis of the European sciences and transcendental phenomenology* (D. Carr, Trans.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1937).

Husserl, E. (1970b). The origin of geometry. In *The Crisis of the European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology* (pp. 353-358) (D. Carr, Trans.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press. (Original work composed 1937).

Husserl, E. (1970c). The attitude of natural science and the attitude of humanistic science. In *The Crisis of the European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology* (pp. 315-334) (D. Carr, Trans.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press. (Original work composed 1937).

Hua, J. (2009). "Gucci Geishas" and post-feminism. *Women's Studies in Communication, 32,* 63-88.

Isa, M. (2000). Phenomenological analysis of the reentry experiences of the wives of Japanese corporate sojourners. *Women & Language, 23,* 26-40.

Jackson, R. L. (1998). Tracing the evolution of "race," "ethnicity," and "culture" in communication studies. *Howard Journal of Communications, 9,* 41-55.

Lanigan R. (1969). Rhetorical criticism: An interpretation of Maurice Merleau-Ponty. *Philosophy & Rhetori1970a, 2,* 61-71.

Lindholm, C. (1998). Love and structure. *Theory, Culture & Society, 15,* 243-263.

McPhail, M. L. (1996). Race and sex in hack and white: Essence and ideology in the Spike Lee discourse. *Howard Journal of Communications, 7,* 127-138.

Martinez, J. M. (2006). Semiotic phenomenology and intercultural communication scholarship: Meeting the challenge of racial, ethni1970a, and cultural difference. *Western Journal of Communication, 70,* 292-310.

Rosenfield, L. (1974). The experience of criticism. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 60,* 489-496.

Sundén, J. (2001). What happened to difference in cyberspace? The (re)turn of the she-cyborg..*Feminist Media Studies, 1,* 215-232.

Suter, E. A. (2004). Tradition never goes out of style: The role of tradition in women's naming practices. *Communication Review, 7,* 57-87.

Weeks, J. (1998). The sexual citizen. *Theory, Culture & Society, 15,* 35-52.

Weiss, D. (2005). Constructing the queer "I": Performativity, citationality, and desire in *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy*. *Popular Communication, 3,* 73-95.

Young, G. (2004). From broadcasting to narrowcasting to 'mycasting': A new-found celebrity in queer Internet communities. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies, 18,* 43-62.

'I don't want to become a rules cop': An Organizational Culture and Leadership Discourse Analysis of the NPDA as a Failed Organization

Audra R. Diers, Ph.D.
Marist College

Abstract

On March 23, 2010 Dr. Robert Trapp, former President of the National Parliamentary Debate Association (NPDA), posted a message to the parli listserve (parli-l) suggesting the final round of the national tournament lacked the substance and nuance that the community should see in debate. Trapp's post reflects a larger issue in the NPDA—the emergent divide and disparate organizational cultures emerging over the organization's short lifetime. This paper investigates the often discussed, but still under-developed relationship between leadership and culture in mission-based organizations by analyzing the discourse of cultural leadership in the NPDA from 1994 to 1999. Findings suggest that the organizational challenges in the NPDA today are strongly linked to failures in the organization's early leaders to codify the shared values and mission of the organization. In fact, the leaders seemed to actively create a discourse of disdain for official clarity in organizational mission and purpose during its formative years. Theoretical and future implications are discussed.

Keywords: NPDA, parli-l, organizational culture, organizational leadership

Introduction

To read a history of the National Parliamentary Debate Association's formation (Johnson, Johnson, & Trapp, 1999) is to read a story of a grassroots organization. Yet conspicuously absent from this history is a strong focus on the mission or shared values of the NPDA as an 'audience-centered' style of debate—what emerges from the history is a structural accounting of the organization's formation and rapid growth. The same collaborators who formed the organization and wrote its history also have academic publications about the centrality of audience-centered accessible debate in NPDA (Johnson, 1997; Trapp, 1996; Trapp, 2000). However, these collaborators largely rejected the codification of rules and organizational structures that would preserve the mission and vision of the NPDA during their tenure as presidents of the NPDA during the organization's formative years.

As we look at the state of the NPDA today, we see an organization whose participation has—at the very least—leveled off and also faced serious decline in some geographic regions; we see an organization with substantial internal conflict (Snider, 2008); and we see an activity that barely resembles the mission or vision described in early writings about parliamentary debate. In fact, the NPDA has no 'official' statement of goals (Amsden, 2003). Nearly the only thing remaining of the NPDA, as a style of debate, are the very broad guidelines identifying time limits and general tournament procedures codified in 1995. In

fact, if we 'Google' the rules of the NPDA the only search results point to a broad description of the activity as 'two on two' limited preparation-style of debate that does not allow prepared materials to be used during the debate and the time limits (Anonymous). This suggests that if we want to understand the evolution of the NPDA, as an organization, we have to examine the foundational discussions that shaped the norms, values, and priorities in the NPDA—that is public discussions about the organization's formation, structure, and priorities. Previous research has clearly identified there is a disconnect between the espoused values of the NPDA and the values of the judges, coaches, and competitors with regards to what occurs or should occur within a round of debate (Amsden, 2003; Diers & Birkholt, 2004). Yet there is no research or analysis connecting the values, goals, and priorities of the members with the pervasive organizational culture or founding leadership of the organization, despite organizational researchers' findings that organizational leaders are critical in shaping the discourse and values of an emergent organization (Applbaum, 1999 485; Beyer & Browning, 1999; Bryman, 1999; Gill, Levine, & Pitt, 1998; Mills, 1995).

It is with this backdrop that when I read Dr. Trapp's posting on the parli-l (see Appendix A)— in March, 2010 lamenting the style and structure of 'modern' parliamentary debate, I could not help but see the irony in his concerns about the style and content of the debate and its relationship to public discourse because it was Dr. Trapp who, as the NPDA's president mused in 1997 that, "… my primary reaction is that I don't want to become a rules cop" in reference to a thread on the then active parli-l addressing organizational policy questions relating to the use of preparation time.

No matter whether those involved in the intercollegiate forensics community like or dislike the state of the NPDA parliamentary debate, view the changes associated with the emergence of the NPTE (National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence) as positive for the activity, or yearn for days gone by; there is no denying that the organization has fundamentally failed to support its espoused central mission and is presently struggling to identify itself. In this issue, I believe there are rich organizational leadership and organizational culture lessons to be learned. Therefore, instead of addressing the relative value of the changes in the NPDA my purpose in this paper is to examine the NPDA from an organizational perspective to identify the communicative problems that facilitated the 'unintended' changes in the activity so forensics organizations can better frame and address issues of purpose and goals, particularly in environments where our programs must increasingly justify their existence and benefit to our academic institutions. In so doing, this analysis addresses a critical weakness in the leadership and culture literature by explicitly exploring the leadership culture connection (Banntu-Gomez & Rohrer, 2011).

The Intersection of Organizational Culture and Leadership

As Diers and Birkholt (2004) argue, the practice of debate often advances faster than the theoretical grounding and organizational responses to emergent practices. This argument is in line with findings regarding geographically dis-

persed organizations (Diers & Birkholt, 2002). In fact, Scott, Corman, and Cheney (1998) argue one of the challenges that such organizations face is that organizational members must identify with one another, with the organization, and with the organization's values in order for the organization to remain intact and viable. Moreover, they assert strong positive communication interactions underscore the long-term effectiveness of geographically dispersed organizations. Welleford and Dudley (2000), however, identify a tension between strong identity and keeping an organization's values relevant for members, suggesting that active dialogues about the organization's direction, purposes, and practices are critical an organization's identity and relevance. Underscoring this tension is the important role leaders serve in developing, maintaining, and facilitating change in the shared values of an organization (Amernic & Craig, 2007; Banntu-Gomez & Rohrer, 2011). In this brief review of foundational literature addressing the leadership cultural connection, my goal is to establish a viable model for analyzing the leadership culture connection appropriate for a mission-driven organization like the NPDA.

Defining Organizational Culture

Conceptually, when we are talking about identity, mission, practices, and communication, we are necessarily addressing issues of organizational culture. Trice and Beyer (1993) explain that organizations:

> …arrive at their shared ideologies through collective experience and repeated social interactions over time. They use cultural forms to communicate and reinforce these shared ideologies. Organizational cultures, like other cultures, develop as groups of people struggle together to make sense of and cope with their worlds. (p. 4)

In this definition of organizational culture, Trice and Beyer (1993) emphasize that culture is a compilation of an organization's ideologies, which are hard to measure in typical research language, but that those ideologies are made concrete in the forms the culture takes on including the symbols communicated, language used in the organization, narratives told, and the routine practices of members. Trice and Beyer's conceptualization of culture suggests culture is created, maintained, and changed in the communicative processes within an organization (Hatch, 2000).

This approach to analyzing organizational culture is particularly relevant for the NPDA because organizations that fail to create a shared identity are less likely to build and maintain commitment to the organization's mission and are ultimately more likely to fail in the long run (Bennington, Shetler, & Shaw, 2003; Bodkin, Amato, & Peters, 2009). The NPDA is an organization that was formed as coaches from different genres of debate competition, unsatisfied with the practices that had become normative in other organizations, collaborated to develop a 'more audience-centered' style of debate. Over time, membership in the NPDA grew as programs from at least five different styles of intercollegiate debate came together in competition, suggesting that a disparate set of ideas,

practices, and values merged in the NPDA. Thus, the only way for the NPDA to be successful in developing and proliferating the founders shared values, would be to have the organization build a cultural and attitudinal commitment to maintaining its central mission (Bodkin, et al., 2009).

Organizational Cultural Leadership Discourse

More than being a useful or interesting heuristic, understanding an organization's culture is necessary to understand its decision making since policy is unlikely to be made let alone enforced without the support of a culture that 'buys into' the policy agenda (Mills, 1995). While there is not an extensive amount of research explicitly examining the leadership culture connection, the findings consistently demonstrate these factors influence the outcomes of an organization (Banntu-Gomez & Rohrer, 2011). Banntu and Rohrer (2011) argued a leader's job, by definition, is managing meaning to drive the members understanding of the organization's values, purpose, and activities. If the leader communicates successfully, they build a narrative that is consistent with the members' view of the organization, thus building a loyal constituency. More than building support, the authors argue that the organization's work capacity will also grow. This suggests using the NPDA as a case study is an excellent way to analyze the leadership culture connection in organizations. Further, because culture is built and maintained in communicative practices, I propose that a cultural leadership discourse analysis of the NPDA will reveal valuable information in the study of the leadership culture connection in organizations. Previous research suggests there are three core principles connecting organizational culture and leadership: leaders shape organizational practices (e.g., Tesone, 2000); leadership connects to the routinization of an organization's culture (e.g., Beyer & Browning, 1999); and leaders serve a reflexive function to manage meaning (e.g., Sandler, 2009).

Leaders' priorities shape organizational practice. Mills (1995) analysis of diversity initiatives in British Airways found that not only do social and organizational discourses affect how people view their organizational realities, but that organizational leaders are critical in shaping those discourses. In emerging organizations, early leaders carry the weight of an organization's cultural formation, values, and preferences more so than leaders at any other point in the organization's development (Beyer & Browning, 1999). Additionally, one advantage strong leadership in mission-centered organizations have is that members are highly motivated by the organization's mission, which is strongly related to high levels of performance (Banntu-Gomez & Rohrer, 2011; Tesone, 2000). Tesone (2000) argues that when leaders use mission as a way to motivate members, their high level of emotional involvement produces high performance and identification with the organization. This suggests organizational leaders who successfully communicate and encourage the routinization of practices are more likely to have strong influence in their organizations.

Routinization of organizational culture by members. In a case study of a mission-based technology research organization, Beyer and Browning (1999)

found that because the managers implemented the founder's vision for the organization, it effectively cemented both the espoused values and routines as a part of everyday practice. In fact, Hatch (2000) argues leaders' power in organizations is necessarily limited by the extent to which their ideas, priorities, and values are routinized in the 'everyday' practices of organizational members. This suggests that if the members share a leader's organizational priorities, then there is likely to be a high level of similarity between the espoused mission and practices in the organization. However, the greater the level of incongruity between the members' vision of the organization and the espoused vision of the organization the greater the possibility for a disconnect between the mission and practices (Bodkin, et al., 2009; Hatch, 2000; Welleford & Dudley, 2000).

Leaders serve a reflexive function to manage meaning. Essentially, it is the leaders' responsibility to actively manage what an organization's mission is and how that relates to the daily work of the organization (Sandler, 2009). When well managed, an organizational mission helps organizations to maintain their identity and enforce standards within the organization (Fairhurst, Jordan, & Neuwirth, 1997). However, one of the primary tensions in organizational life lies between the organization's construction and the ongoing social process of cultural change and adaptation and in many ways who 'controls' how the organization changes and in what ways it changes (Fairhurst, 2001; Trice & Beyer, 1993). To effectively understand this dualism we should recognize that, 'regular' conversations within an organization are important artifacts of that culture (Eisenberg & Riley, 2001); that the social and organizational discourses affect how people view their organizational reality (Mills, 1995); and that most importantly organizational leaders can influence the organization's conversation (Boje, Luhman, & Baack, 1999; Bryman, 1999; Mills, 1995).

Boje, et al. (1999) explain that the 'hegemonic' force in an organization can serve to provide a grand narrative that links organizational work, organizational members, and can camouflage or even change the meaning of all the individual stories (i.e., different members interpretations of the organization). This hegemonic force is not necessarily the organization's leaders; however, leadership in organizations is largely about managing the meaning (Banntu-Gomez & Rohrer, 2011; Boin & Hart, 2003; Bryman, 1999). Bryman argues leadership manages meaning in organizations in three ways: first, good leadership is a process of influence or persuasion; second, these influence processes occur in a group context that either reaffirms the leader's interpretation or refutes it; and third, leaders influence group behaviors by directing the group towards organizational goals. Each of these functions manages the meaning not only of the organization but also of the ways that members' engage with the organization.

Analyzing the NPDA's Formative Years

Given that previous research from 2004 (see Diers & Birkholt, 2004) found there is a strong disconnect between the espoused values of the NPDA and the practices in the organization and that previous organizational research suggests examining both the regular conversations (e.g., Eisenberg & Riley, 2001) as

well as the interpretation of the organization's mission and values from its leaders (e.g., Beyer & Browning, 1999; Bryman, 1999), to understand how the NPDA arrived at its present state of identity crisis, we should analyze the conversations that critically shaped the NPDA.

In most organizations, it would not be possible to examine this kind of information more than 15 years later; however, as a geographically dispersed organization, the NPDA has used discussion boards and listserves as its primary mode of communicating, outside of bi-annual meetings at the National Communication Association Annual Convention and the NPDA Championship Tournament. At present, much of the conversation about NPDA issues occurs on Net-Benefits; however, few of the organization's officers regularly participate in those conversations. While the parli-l today is used for little more than tournament and job announcements, from 1994 to 1999 it was used as an important location to address and discuss issues related to the organization, its rules and norms, as well as its governance. For example, in 1995 President Steve Johnson of Creighton University proposed alternative times for competition in NPDA and sought feedback using the parli-l. The NPDA uses those time limits today. In 1996, as a response to discussion about tournament procedures President Robert Trapp proposed and the community discussed national tournament rules using the parli-l. Those remain as the basis for the NPDA's rules. Finally, in 1997 as concerns regarding student conduct in debate rounds emerged and were debated on the parli-l, President Trapp responded by creating a Sexual Harassment Committee that ultimately produced the Sexual Harassment policies and procedures still used by the NPDA. Therefore, by examining the public archives[1] of the parli-l, we can conduct a cultural leadership discourse analysis of the NPDA and better understand the organizational reasons that the NPDA is presently facing an identity crisis and make recommendations for other forensics organizations.

Data Collection and Analysis Methods

The public archives of the parli-l from October, 1994 (when the list was opened) through March, 1999 were examined using a method of constant comparison method (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) to use the previous literature as a source of comparison in the data (broadly on the organization's discussions about rules, norms, and procedures). Following Strauss and Corbin's (1990) procedures for conducting a constant comparison analysis, I first examined foundational literature on organizational culture and leadership to provide a point of comparison to the data because familiarity with relevant literature can enhance sensitivity to nuances in the data. Second, I used the systematic comparison of phenomena in order to analyze the messages from the parli-l to identify those relevant to issues of organizational culture formation and leadership, identifying 270 relevant messages. Messages from the same author that dupli-

[1] The full archive of the NPDA "Parli-L" are located at: https://lists.bethel.edu/mailman/private/parli. These are publicly available (with free subscription).

cated their initial posts were excluded in favor of focusing on new ideas for each major discussion thread emerging. Third, in analyzing the messages themselves, I used an open coding procedure focusing on a thematic analysis using each message as a unit of analysis to identify the overall themes communicated across the population. Once those themes were revealed, the messages were related to the model of leadership cultural discourse previously discussed.

The NPDA's Early "Rules" and "Norms" Discussions

Based on the constant comparison approach, three broad categories of conversation amongst the members occurred: identification of the purposes or mission of the organization; discussions of tournament policies nor norms; and procedural announcements from the organization's leaders. Taken together, these conversations reflect a very strong trend—that despite active discussion and differences of opinion amongst the membership, the early leaders either refrained from taking a policy position on 'rules' or actively argued against creating or enforcing rules to maintain the organization's broad mission. In particular between 1995 and 1997, often discussions of specific topics or issues would ultimately end up in a "why rules" response from then President Robert Trapp. Later, after Trapp's presidency had ended as initiatives relating to issues such as coaching during preparation time or qualification procedures for the national tournament emerged, despite discussion or support for ideas from new NPDA leaders, tournament hosts, and students the early refusal to make and codify rules persisted suggesting that the early cultural norms and failure to routinize the mission of the organization offers the best explanation for the NPDA's current identity crisis and drift from its espoused mission. More specifically, this section will discuss each of the three content categories that emerged.

The purpose of the NPDA as a focus for discussion. From 1994 to 1995 there were a number of discussions that focused on the NPDA's mission and compared that purpose to other debate organizations—most notably the Cross Examination Debate Association—in order to try to more clearly define and discuss the nature of parliamentary debate. After 1994-1995, this 'mission-oriented' discussion became less prevalent and more of an appeal or argument in support of other initiatives later. However, what was interesting about the early mission discussions was the malleability of the practice of parliamentary debate, but with an inherent assumption that parliamentary debate was an activity with a clear and strong mission. The organizational leaders often emphasized concern that in our interest to define parliamentary debate, we should not strictly construct the activity because it could result in weakening the intellectual pursuits of the activity. Three posts—one from Ed Inch, then Director of Forensics at Pacific Lutheran University and future NPDA president; from Dr. Robert Trapp, Director of Forensics at Willamette University and future NPDA president; and from Steve Johnson, then Director of Forensics at Creighton University and NPDA president best reflect these assumptions.

> I think that CEDA has made some mistakes among certain segments of its population. Is the answer to ban or severly [sic] curtail one type of evidence? Is that educationally sound? Is that the objective of the NPDA to stress argumentation skills in all but one area? It seems to me that the NPDA (or at least some members) is willing to chuck the kid with the bathwater. Maybe the answer is not to by rule censor the students inventio [sic]…. As a community we need to think about what we are and how we define our mission. I am very, very concerned with artificial rules that prevent students from exploring certain types of arguments and even more concerned when students come to think of evidence as "bad"…. I also endorse the idea of experimentation. NPDA is defining itself. I hope it does not suffer from a "groupthink" mentality and believe that the current form is be best without experimenting and being open to other forms. We should believe sufficiently in what we are duing [sic] to try different things (Ed Inch, parli-l post December 1, 1994).

> In the first place, parliamentary debate has enjoyed worldwide popularity much longer than CEDA has even existed. Second, we need to make parliamentary good debate on its own ground rather than try to form it as a contrast to some other form of debate that we dislike. Thus, we shouldn't "ban evidence." (I agree with Ed Inch that banning evidence from argument is like saying you want to take a shower without getting wet.) We need to focus on evidence as one form of support of an argument and should develop criteria what is good evidence and what is not…. As I said, my reading of the current "rules" to prohibit use of materials during the preparation period. In fact, I don't believe NPDA has any rules--just a set of unofficial guidelines which were borrowed from one undergraduate debater from Mount Holyoke in 1991 (Robert Trapp, parli-l post February 15, 1995).

> This position is consistant [sic] with the two other parliamentary debate governing bodies with which the NPDA has aligned itself. Neither the APDA nor the World Debate Council allows the use of external evidence after the announcement of the resolution. Again, this is not a statement about how things *should be,* but rather about how they *are.* I encourage the debate about this issue, and would further encourage those interested in moving the NPDA toward this format to propose this as a formal mandate (and, by the way, I would also encourage those that *oppose* this format to argue against such a proposed mandate) (Steve Johnson, February 24, 1995).

Overall, the mission and purpose of NPDA was not a strong primary area of conversation from 1995 to 1999; in fact, while some members used the mission (i.e., audience-centered accessible debate) as a source of support for ideas, the organization's leaders did not make the mission a central point of their posts nor a central point of support for policies communicated on the parli-l. This clearly stands in stark contrast to these same leaders' academic arguments and writings

regarding the purpose of the NPDA. Yet, what is also clear from these early posts is a strong dedication to a democratic organization where members can genuinely participate in shaping the organization, even to a point where the traditional 'conventions' associated with parliamentary debate, as it was practiced around the world, were questioned. For example, John Meany, Director of Forensics at Claremont Colleges wrote in December, 1997:

> There is so little written about parliamentary debate that I want to generate some listserv or backchannel commentary from the parliamentary debate community re practice. I am interested in justifications, rather than descriptions, of current practice. I want to begin with some of the obvious distinguishing characteristics of practice, including location and position of the subjects of the debate.
> 1. Why 'locate' the debate in parliament?
> 2. Why should the 'government' have a role in the debate?
> 3. Why should the opening proposition speaker be the 'Prime Minister'?

to which then president Robert Trapp responded:

> Good questions. I've thought about them and don't have any good reasons of my own for these conventions.

And while there was quite a bit of member conversation regarding the benefits and disadvantages of such conventions, the practical reality is that today these conventions are not typically practiced suggesting that without strong leadership support of organizational norms; those norms are unlikely to persist when questioned by some within the organization. This small example is endemic of the problem of the early NPDA leadership's unwillingness to advocate the organizational mission through routine interactions with the membership on the parli-l.

The practice of parliamentary debate discussed. The overwhelming majority of the posts on the parli-l from 1994-1999 focused on the in-round (and pre-round) practices of competitors, coaches, and judges with a range of topics actively discussed including rules about in-round argumentation, the use of evidence before and during the debate, expectations for attire, topics used for debate, 'canned' cases, mutual preference judging, low point wins, and sexual harassment/ safety in rounds. In large part, these conversations were coaches, judges, and competitors seeking to identify and discuss the appropriate norms for the performance of parliamentary debate in the NPDA.

One common topic of discussion throughout the years studied was the question of what was appropriate in terms of the use of resources during preparation time. The discussion evolved from Steve Johnson asking then Director of Forensics at Oregon State University Tricia Knapp to create a rule that allowed the use of a dictionary during prep time in 1995 to discussions of the use of 'extemp' files or personal notebooks continuing from 1995 through 1999. Standard practice today is that all evidence is appropriate to consult during preparation time, including an unwritten expectation that competitors should have access to the Internet during preparation time. So, absent clear policies one way or another,

clear organizational norms emerged supporting the use of evidence during preparation time.

An interesting issue related to preparation time was that of coaching during preparation time. In the early days of the NPDA, it was a cultural taboo—simply something that was not done and was not viewed as appropriate. Yet, over the years, that norm began to change. The conversation on the parli-l reflected the conversation over what could be accomplished and there was no clear consensus regarding what could be accomplished and there was even a strong sentiment against the practice communicated on the listserve; however, the question of the rule was an entirely separate matter. During the Johnson and Trapp presidencies, the issue was less relevant because of the aforementioned cultural norm; however, during Tom Kuster's (Director of Forensics at Bethany Lutheran College) presidency, the issue became more relevant as an issue relating to rules as the norms began to change. Therefore, as the issue became more important as a question of policy in 1998, the discussion on the parli-l reflected the split in the ideological perspectives with those arguing to support allowing coaching during preparation time as well as those opposing it. Students had voted on the issue for two consecutive years at the student meeting at the NPDA and the posts to the parli-l communicated an overwhelming opposition from students to 'allowing' coaching during preparation time. Additionally, the current president himself opposed coaching during prep time, even suggesting a tournament procedure to make it difficult to coach during preparation time, but he advocated against a rule because: "Lots of coaches don't like prep-time coaching to go on, but feel a rule against it can't be enforced" (February 8, 1998). Yet, despite leadership, a good number of coaches, and overwhelming student opposition to coaching during preparation time, no official NPDA rule ever came to be.

Based on my reading of the archives, we can trace the strong sentiments against rule adoption regarding competitive norms to Robert Trapp's presidency, which was a critical time in the formation of the event. Johnson's presidency focused on the first few years of organizing and standardizing basic practices. Once the organization was stable and growing during Trapp's presidency—expanding members beyond those with initial mission 'buy-in'—genuine questions of policy began to emerge and Trapp remained consistent in his arguments against creating rules to preserve the mission and identify of the NPDA as supporting debate that was audience-centered and adaptive to 'any' audience.

The best illustration of this point was in 1995 just before Trapp presented the official tournament procedures still in use today, there had been an active discussion about the use of rules to make the activity clear and keep it accessible for all audiences and new debaters. Of course, there were many advocates on all sides of the discussion; however, as the discussion progressed there emerged a strong call for rules to make the activity clear:

> Overlooked in the discussion of specific, proscriptive rules has been one rather significant issue. This is, of course, the cost of entry into NPDA events. I teach at a rather small regional university…. What the above means is that these folks are not real high on a "with-itness" scale. They are very con-

> scious about fitting in, about appearing to have a clue. Rules help them do that. For that reason, their favorite debate event is NFA-LD, which follows very specific rules and spells them out clearly in a single page brochure…. Concrete rules let them debate the topic and let them know what to expect. That is a huge advantage. They are not interested in playing debater games; they are interested in arguing about the resolution, challenging others' reasoning and defending their own. Rules might give them a chance to do that. One other advantage: rules level the playing field, or at least grade it on the basis of insight into the resolution rather than familiarity with debating at tournaments. Rules make debate theory discussions moot (oin [sic] most cases), because they allow even a lay judge to fairly interpret challenges and violations. Thus rules based debate may be expected to more fully focus on the resolution (Bob Greenstreet, then Director of Forensics at East Central University, November 28, 1995).

Following this discussion, Trapp agreed that the activity's clarity did facilitate better competition, posting the tournament rules[2] that would be enacted for the 1996 National Tournament (and largely remain unchanged to this day). Though these tournament procedures did not address many advocates' arguments about the real need for clarity on the purpose and identity of the activity—a point discussed on the parli-l, Trapp ultimately clarified his intentions for the rules, clearly indicating that he felt the procedural rules that were put in place were all that were needed for the NPDA to operate effectively:

> I want to express my appreciation to all of the people who gave constructive comments on my draft of the 1996 NPDA Championship Tournament Rules. I have used those comments to revise the rules. Today I am mailing a packet containing these rules, the tournament invitation, and other materials to all member schools. At this time I want to express my intentions about these rules. (1) The purpose of these rules is to define the procedures of the debate so that, to the extent possible, everyone will enter the debates with a shared set of expectations…. (2) I view these rules as expanding, not limiting, the choices that debaters can make….(3) In framing this set of rules, I have, to the best of my ability, tried to preserve the procedures that we have all come to expect….I hope the rules are received in the spirit in which they are intended--to create a shared set of expectations and a level playing field--not as a method of restricting and punishing debaters. Again, I appreciate everyone's input in the process of creating these rules (February 1, 1996).

The most important component of Trapp's response is his second intention regarding the rules to emphasize that he, personally, did not believe in limiting the

[2] Posting of the National Tournament procedures in Trapp's post are at: https://lists.bethel.edu/mailman/private/parli/1996-February/021047.html

choices that debaters can make. This point was reiterated in a number of posts both before and after this statement about the procedures:

> In my opinion, the only support for their (i.e., time-space shifts in use must be on a debate-by-debate basis (October 5, 1995).

> I could easily be convinced that NPDA needs a set of clear rules of procedure. The rules should be clear enough to avoid the overreach of enforcement. A rule that says "debaters should speak at a reasonable rate of speed" is not clear because various judges would interpret it in various ways and worse, the existence of such a rule would give licenze [sic] to some to punish students with more zeal than is necessary. Rules should be about procedures, not about arguments (November 26, 1995).

> I do NOT favor any additional rules regarding coaching or use of materials during prep time. I don't want to see tabrooms (especially the NPDA nationals tabroom) become involved in disputes about enforcement of this or other practices ouside [sic] of the debates. I also don't want to get into disputes and potential enforcement of questions like what constitutes coaching (asking the coach where the bathroom is, a coach wishing the team good luck, etc)…. **But, my primary reaction is that I don't want to become a rules cop** (September 8, 1995)**.**
> On Mon, 13 Apr 1998, Jon Loging wrote: *NPDA community, We should debate the case in front of us, and not the rule book.*

> My nomination for the best post of the year!!! (April 13, 1998).

In Trapp's arguments against rules, he even suggested that existing argumentative rules be removed:

> Can someone give me a good reason why points of order should not be dropped from the rules of parliamentary debate (September 23, 1997).

This suggests very strongly that from 1994-1999 Robert Trapp, president for much of that period, was very clearly an advocate against creating rules regarding the practice of parliamentary debate at a time that the organization was defining itself, its strongest organizational values, and creating normative practices for the activity. In fact, the issue of rules related to the practice of parliamentary debate was the most consistent topic on which Trapp posted during this time. Consequently, because of his position of leadership, identification as a "founder", and early opinion leadership his positions often set the tone for the conduct of the organization's business and identity. This was, as Boje, et al. (1999) really identified as the hegemonic voice in the organization and he exercised his voice on the issue of rules most consistently.

Rules and procedure announcements. The final predominant discussion theme centered around the organization's leadership using the parli-l to spread important information about the organization, changes in the organization, or

ideas for the organization. Most of the time, these discussions were surrounded by discussions of debate practice, so the leaders took the opportunity to either take action or communicate action taken in a topically relevant format. For example, in response to concerns regarding government versus opposition advantage, Steve Johnson used the list serve to announce the new times that would be used at the 1995 NPDA National Tournament and seek feedback. He also used the parli-l to identify procedures related to the use of dictionaries in rounds previously discussed. Additionally, Johnson used the parli-l as a source of feedback on the activity in its earliest days of formation. Trapp also used the parli-l in the same way to offer tournament procedures to be enacted for 1996, to respond to community concerns regarding sexual harassment by forming a sexual harassment committee and announcing the NPDA policy on sexual harassment in 1997 and 1998. Additionally, the parli-l was used to identify limitation issues on team entry for the 1998 and 1999 national tournaments. All of these topics certainly generated conversation, but demonstrated the organization's leadership using the parli-l as a source of communication about changes and policies within the organization.

Discussion of the Emergent NPDA Culture and Leadership

Taken together, an analysis of the discourse and discussions of the members and leaders of the NPDA from 1994-1999 strongly demonstrate that in a geographically dispersed organization, like the NPDA, we can learn much about the leadership culture connection in organizations. In the case of the NPDA, the discussions from the mid-to-late 1990's still affect the organization even a decade later. Clearly, the largest portion of the story that I have told has been the story of the leaders' communication and interaction on the parli-l and that by no means suggests the organization has been guided by an iron fist; quite the contrary, because the leaders invited participation and discussion using the listserve as a way to interrogate issues of policy for the organization, there was much participation in the organization's development. However, when we apply an analysis of the cultural leadership discourse, we find the leaders' discourse strongly influenced the decision-making during the organization's formation, even under-cutting decision-making after those leaders were no longer in office. Therefore, this section will analyze the progression of the NPDA's policy making through the lens of the cultural leadership discourse analysis discussed earlier.

Leader Priorities Shape Organizational Practice

Organizational culture and leadership research suggests leaders shape discourse (Mills, 1995), early leaders most affect the organization's development (Beyer & Browning, 1999), and that what those leaders encourage or discourage matters (Tesone, 2000). The NPDA's early leadership set a clear stage for the issues that were appropriate issues of NPDA policy. The analysis of the routine discussions on the parli-l clearly demonstrates a disdain for 'rules' or even normative proscriptions that could have maintained the organization's identity. Instead, the leadership preferred a model that allowed the debaters and judges to

construct the meaning of the event within the rounds of debate. Robert Trapp's arguments against rules and preference for in-round construction of arguments, evidence, and practices was the most influential both because of the timing of his tenure as president of the NPDA as well as because of his consistency of response on the parli-l opposing such measures. Considering this, there is then a strong measure of irony in his post from 2010 (see Appendix A) and his reflection on the final round of debate in 2010 as something that would give cause for concern, both because of the substance of the debate but also as a reflection of public discourse at a larger level because his very clear 'debate it out' philosophy has dominated NPDA practice and policy making.

Yet, even without a strong desire for official policy making to enforce the organization's mission, there was little evidence of the NPDA leadership's advocacy for the NPDA's mission on the parli-l. However, there were clear articulations of the mission's support outside of the parli-l by these same leaders, as previously discussed. This supports the organizational research indicating that the most important cultural discourse is that which occurs because of regular interactions within an organization's boundaries—either physical or electronic. This also demonstrates that if the NPDA's leaders wanted to keep the mission relevant for the members—particularly as the organization was experiencing its first substantial growth between 1994 and 1999—that they had to take an active role in setting the activity's priorities and failed to do so.

Beyond the case of the NPDA, these findings strongly suggest that in mission-based organizations, even ones with vocal member participation, the leader is the central figure in developing and shaping all forms of the organization's culture. This is consistent with previous research, but gives longitudinal evidence supporting the lasting effects of the formative leadership cultural connection. Yet, the most theoretically rich finding is that when and where leaders advocate for the mission of the organization matters. Members of the NPDA knew these leaders strongly advocated audience-centered debate—it was a small community—yet, the leaders' "outside" advocacy (i.e., publishing critiques) for the importance of audience-centered debate did not translate to lasting values and norms. This suggests the timing and location of leaders' communication of identity and shared values matters.

Routinization by Organizational Members

Organizational cultural researchers have found everyday practice by members strongly affects the organization's development (Beyer & Browning, 1999) and if members and leaders share priorities there is likely to be a strong overlap between mission and practices (Hatch, 2000; Welleford & Dudley, 2000). The analysis of the NPDA reveals there were essentially two NPDA organizational cultures—the de jure and de facto cultures. The de jure culture focuses on public argumentation that is accessible to audiences, critics, and competitors no matter their background in debate and the de facto culture focuses on an organic growth of the activity—something where the meaning of the activity is really co-created by normative practices. This may seem perfectly normal to many; however, what makes the NPDA novel in the 'organic' model of organizational culture

development is that where most organizational researchers would identify a disconnect between leaders and members goals, the leaders lead the charge for the socially constructed organization—seemingly no matter the cost in terms of the mission of the organization.

Consequently, Diers and Birkholt's (2004) findings that there was a strong disconnect between the espoused values of the NPDA and those reinforced by coaches, judges, and competitors with their in-round preferences are well-grounded by the conversations occurring in the formative years of the NPDA. Essentially, the routinization of the NPDA's values by its members had little to do with the mission and purpose of the organization and much more to do with a philosophical commitment to open the activity to such a point that it had no clear identity nor direction; instead, it was socially constructed by an increasingly technical group of debaters and coaches as more schools left the Cross Examination Debate Association and the National Debate Tournament activities. Those voices were comparatively louder than the members favoring the original mission of the activity indicating that the routinization of debate practices was dominated by an organic social construction that stood in direct competition with the initial mission. Based in this analysis, I believe it is clear that the groundwork for this shift was laid in the conversations about the identity and prevailing approach to governing the NPDA in the early years of the organization. Conceptually, this demonstrates that consistency in advocacy and managing practices is may be more important than merely managing the grand narrative of the organization. If leaders primarily focus on celebrating the grand narrative of their organization instead of attending to the practices in the organization, there is likely to be a disconnect between the two.

Leaders Serve a Reflexive Function to Manage Meaning

Foundational research in a cultural evaluation of leadership suggests it is organizational leaders' responsibility to actively manage the organization's mission and that mission's relationship to daily routines (Fairhurst, et al., 1997) because "regular" conversations reflect what is important in the organization (Eisenberg & Riley, 2001), and leaders provide the grand narrative linking the organization, its work, and its members (Boje, et al., 1999; Mills, 1995). As I have previously argued, the analysis of the early parli-l discussions clearly indicate the early organizational leaders and de facto opinion leaders in the NPDA were poor stewards of the NPDA's mission and that their grand narrative not only showed clear deference to an organically created and maintained organizational culture, but with a rigorous and consistent refutation of normative rules or policies, created a hegemonic silencing force against members who wanted to take action to clearly define and defend the organization's mission. The first president argued for a vigorous discussion of what the NPDA would mean and how its practices would develop; however, the second president's advocacy was much more directional often ending conversations about policy-related issues with the pronouncement of a procedural change or a denunciation of normative rule making. In combination, instead of actively identifying the purpose of the organization and asking questions about how that purpose could be maintained,

the first two presidents opened the conversation about the nature of the activity and then not only seemed to actively avoid posting to support the organization's mission in rules or policy related conversations, but went a step further as the organization developed to oppose any policy-based efforts to maintain the organization's mission.

This suggests that as the organization rapidly grew, new members and an organizational discourse that actively encouraged the 'make-it-up-as-we-go' model of "debating it out in rounds" quickly outnumbered the small group of founding members with a clear understanding and support for the organization's mission. Absent in the NPDA's development were organizational leaders that actually served a strong reflexive function to manage the meaning of organic debating interests in terms of the purpose of the activity. Bryman (1999) argued leaders can exert influence in group contexts that either reaffirms or refutes interpretations of the organization's purpose and culture and that leaders influence group behaviors by directing the group towards the organization's cultures. This analysis of discussions on the parli-l related to rules, policy, and vision for the NPDA clearly suggests this essential leadership function was conspicuously absent. Often in the cultural leadership literature (Trice & Beyer, 1993) specifically and the organizational leadership literature more broadly (Witherspoon, 1996), the work is framed by an explicit disconnect between leadership (the big-picture) and management (the day-to-day). The leadership culture connection identified in this analysis suggests it may be a mistake to separate leadership and management functions within an organization.

Placing the NPDA in the Context of Intercollegiate Forensics and Leadership

The case of the NPDA is illustrative for both the study of the leadership culture connection as well as for forensics organizations. There are three theoretically rich findings emerging from this case that should be evaluated with additional research. First, leaders must be advocates for their organization's identity and culture within their organizations, not merely outside of their organizations. These findings demonstrate that even if the membership knows what the leaders believe in, unless those values are actively communicated in the interactions within the organization, they are not likely to emerge as shared values over time. Second, the 'grand narrative' of any organization only matters if the routine practices of the organization are consistent with the grand narrative. Cultural disconnects between the two must be actively managed or the grand narrative is ultimately likely to be irrelevant. Related and finally, as modern organizations expand where physical boundaries are less rigid, the line between leadership and management functions may be blurred. These data suggest if leaders fail to attend to the practices in the organization, they may lose control of their organizations in the long-term.

For the NPDA more directly, the NPDA has developed an organization that is/was appealing to many Directors of Forensics, as evidenced by the number of member organizations and continued large entry at the national tournament. Yet, one question I have explored is, 'has the NPDA created a definable and sustain-

able style of debate for intercollegiate competition?' and I believe the answer must be a clear no for a couple of reasons. First, the organization lacks a clear identity and subscription to an overall set of shared values; instead, what is valued in the activity is an artificial notion of intellectual freedom that masks a strongly routinized set of practices (see Diers & Birkholt, 2004). For those interested in supporting those routinized practices, including the style of argumentation that Trapp commented on in his 2010 "musings" about the final round of debate, there is no conflict and no problem with the current evolution of the activity. However, for others, there is strong conflict most notably evidenced by the 2008 Kirksville conference that brought together NPDA leaders concerned with the de facto practices. However, I believe the effort to shift the NPDA's culture after this conference have a limited potential to be effective because of the dominant culture in the activity developed with the early leaders and routinized over the years.

Second, the inherently malleable nature of argumentative preferences and style of debate make the NPDA unsustainable in the long term. Directors have been drawn to the NPDA since 1994 for a host of reasons; however, since 2001 the NPDA has seen substantial changes in the membership including many new schools, but also losing many schools. Furthermore, the emergence of the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence (NPTE), backlash against mutual preference judging, increasing rates of delivery, and a litany of other issues have begun to genuinely divide the membership as competitive visions of what parliamentary debate should look like become less compatible with one another. These issues are all a direct consequence of the organization's inability/unwillingness to create policy and govern the organization in line with the espoused mission or values of the activity.

As a result, it seems incredibly likely that the membership of the NPDA will continue to fracture based on pedagogical and ideological lines until the organization shrinks to a body of like-minded individuals and/or the organization splits into multiple organizations each pursing their own preferences. Unfortunately, in a world of tight college resources and increased pressure for nationally-recognized performance, it becomes more difficult to position participation and success in the NPDA as being financially worthwhile when the activity is either antithetical to its mission or so small that a is it no longer a broad-based national organization with the participation it has long boasted. Now, absent the organic construction of the NPDA (i.e., with a strong set of policies), it is entirely likely that the membership and participation in the activity would have been smaller—much like the National Forensics Association's participation in Lincoln Douglas Debate (NFA LD)[3]. However, there would have likely been a stronger similarity between the mission and practice of the activity, as we see in NFA LD today—an organization that has maintained much of its membership and slowly, but steadily, grown over the last couple of decades.

[3] NFA-LD has and tries to enforce a strongly proscriptive set of rules dictating the dominant approach to the activity. See http://cas.bethel.edu/dept/comm/nfa/ldrules.html for more information.

In the end, it does not matter very much whether we like or dislike the NPDA in its early, middle, or contemporary forms. However, I believe there is a strong lesson in the NPDA's failures for other forensics organizations and forensics educators. The leaders of forensics organizations must be leaders and actively manage their organizations. I can appreciate many forensics educators' interests in encouraging student learning and creativity; however, organizational structure and clarity are not antithetical to student learning and creativity. This is why in our classrooms we set policies; why on our teams we set policies; and why in our forensics organizations sometimes we have to be 'rules cops'. In the end, if we want our forensics organizations to last, be credible, be manageable, and support particular educational and competitive outcomes then leaders must not only keep the mission relevant to members, but actively structure and develop policies and practices that support the mission. A clear and strong set of enforced rules leave the focus of the activity the content and performances instead of structurally forcing meta-debate as the activity is co-created in practice—something that the NPDA has not just allowed but forced with its organic structure and approach. In short, we must learn from and apply organizational and communication research to the good management of our forensics organizations.

Appendix A

https://lists.bethel.edu/mailman/private/parli/2010-March/040966.html
musings
Robert Trapp trapp at willamette.edu
Tue Mar 23 16:59:45 CDT 2010

I'd like to start by congratulating team from Pepperdine and Texas Tech on their success in getting to the finals at NPDA. As a not-so-recent alumni of Texas Tech, I am especially proud of the results they have achieved in the "Joe Gantt Era." Both teams were very talented and clearly demonstrated that they did the kind of work needed to get to these high levels of national competition.

With the successes of these two teams in my mind, I prepared to get on the airplane in Lubbock this morning and picked up a newspaper to occupy my time. In that paper I read that "Sen. John McCain and other Republicans have promised to slow the process down through procedural objections." The parallel was just too stark for me to ignore. In this case, the Republicans have been unable to engage the issue of health reform on its substance, so they turn to procedural arguments as a method to obstruct the debate on the substantive issues." If they can't win of the substantive issues in the debate, they resort to procedure in an attempt to silence their opponents. Don't get me wrong; although Republicans are guilty of this kind of obstructionist debate today, Democrats have used these tactics before.

I know that some say the point of academic debate is simply to teach and to learn "critical thinking." And given that singular goal, debating about procedure instead of substance is no different. But aren't we also trying to teach and learn

about civic engagement as well? And if so, do we really want to reward obstructionist procedural tactics over substantive debate? I suppose one could say that we need to understand procedural tactics in order to learn to overcome them. Fair enough, but I think it's naïve to say that this is the point of what we are doing. We're not engaged in an effort to use procedural arguments to force attention on substance. We're actively engaging procedural arguments as a way to avoid substance.

Perhaps these are simply the musings of an "old buffalo" who just doesn't have the ability to "keep up." I have to say though that these procedural arguments that I have heard aren't really complicated or nuanced enough to do justice to the intellectually powerful students I observed this weekend. From one point of view, the "procedural turn" in
debate seems quite parallel to the Republican Party tactics of today (and Democratic tactics of other times) that have made public debate so vitriolic and obstructionist.

References

Amernic, J. H., & Craig, R. J. (2007). Guidelines for CEO-speak: editing the language of corporate leadership. *Strategy and Leadership, 35*(3), 25-31.

Amsden, B. (2003). The evolution of parliamentary debate: A content analysis of NPDA judging philosophes 1999-2002. *Parliamentary Debate, 8*(1), 92-100.

Anonymous. National Parliamentary Debate Association: Encyclopedia II - National Parliamentary Debate Association - The Rules of NPDA Debate
The Experience Festival Retrieved June 27, 2010, from http://www.experiencefestival.com/a/National_Parliamentary_Debate_Association_-_The_Rules_of_NPDA_Debate/id/1791979

Applbaum, K. (1999). Survival of the biggest: Business policy, managerial discourse, and uncertainty in global business alliance. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 155-164.

Banntu-Gomez, M. B., & Rohrer, W. G. (2011). The influence of the leadership practice "inspiring a shared vision" on group norms in the organizational culture of financial institutions, in the Gambia, West Africa. *The Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge, 17*(1), 156-167.

Bennington, A. J., Shetler, J. C., & Shaw, T. (2003). Negotiating order in interorganizational communication: Discourse analysis of a meeting of three diverse organizations. *Journal of Business Communication, 40*(2), 118-143.

Beyer, J. M., & Browning, L. D. (1999). Transforming an industry in crisis: Charisma, routinization, and supportive cultural leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*(3), 483-520.

Bodkin, C. D., Amato, C., & Peters, C. (2009). The role of conflict, culture, and myth in creating attitudinal commitment. *Journal of Business Research, 62*, 1013-1019.

Boin, A., & Hart, P. (2003). Public leadership in times of crisis: Mission impossible? . *Public Administration Review, 63*(5), 544-553.

Boje, D. M., Luhman, J. T., & Baack, D. E. (1999). Hegemonic stories and encounters between storytelling organizations. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 8*, 323-333.

Bryman, A. (1999). Leadership in organizations. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Managing Organizations: Current Issues* (pp. 26-42). London: Sage.

Diers, A. R., & Birkholt, M. J. (2002). *NPDA Research Agenda*. Paper presented at the National Communication Association Annual Conference, New Orleans, LA.

Diers, A. R., & Birkholt, M. J. (2004). Espoused values versus evaluative preferences: Shaping the future of the NPDA one traditional judge at a time. *Parliamentary Debate, 10*(1), 1-24.

Eisenberg, E. M., & Riley, P. (2001). Organizational culture. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication: Advances in Theory, Research, and Methods* (pp. 291-322). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fairhurst, G. T. (2001). Dualisms in leadership research. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication: Advances in Theory, Research, and Method* (pp. 379-439). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fairhurst, G. T., Jordan, J. M., & Neuwirth, K. (1997). Why are we here? Managing the meaning of an organizational mission statement. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 25*, 243-263.

Gill, R., Levine, N., & Pitt, D. C. (1998). Leadership and organizations for the new millennium. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 5*(4), 46-62.

Hatch, M. J. (2000). The cultural dynamics of organizing and change. In N. M. Ashkanasy, et al. (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate* (pp. 245-260). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Johnson, A., Johnson, S., & Trapp, R. (1999). An Early History of the NPDA Retrieved June 24, 2002

Johnson, S. L. (1997). *Maintaining the status quo: Recommendations for preserving public argument in Parliamentary debate*. Paper presented at the 3rd National Developmental Conference on Individual Events, Houston, TX.

Mills, A. (1995). Man/aging subjectivity, silencing diversity: The case of British Airways. *Organization, 2*, 243-269.

Sandler, C. (2009). The psychological role of the leader in turbulent times. *Strategic HR Review, 8*(3), 30-35.

Scott, C. R., Corman, S. R., & Cheney, G. (1998). Development of a structurational model of identification in the organization. *Communication Theory, 8*, 298-336.

Snider, A. (2008). NPDA Reforms Cause Division in Membership. *Global Debate Blog* Retrieved June 27, 2010, from

http://globaldebateblog.blogspot.com/2008/09/npda-reforms-cause-division-in.html

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Tesone, D. V. (2000). Leadership and motivating missions: A model for organizations from science literature. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*, 60-80.

Trapp, R. (1996). Parliamentary debate as public debate. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 33*, 85-87.

Trapp, R. (2000). Parliamentary debate Retrieved June 27, 2010, from http://www.bethel/edu/Majors/Communication/npda/parliamentary.html

Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1993). *The Cultures of Work Organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Welleford, P. B., & Dudley, L. S. (2000). Persistence of organizational identity within interorganizational relationships. *International Journal of Organizational Theory and Behavior, 3*(3&4), 345-358.

Witherspoon, P. D. (1996). *Communicating Leadership: An Organizational Perspective* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

When Men Are Sexually Harassed: A Foundation for Studying Men's Experiences as Targets of Sexual Harassment

Leland Spencer and Joshua Trey Barnett
University of Georgia

Abstract

While much scholarly attention has been given to sexual harassment, scholarship about men's experiences as targets of sexual harassment has been limited. This essay is a review of the literature about men's experiences of sexual harassment; it explores the operational definitions and sources of sexual harassment, the inadequacy of the instruments used to study sexual harassment, and the implications of this research for organizations and the field of communication studies. It also examines sexual harassment at the intersections of gender and sexual orientation, finding that there are apparent differences in incidences that feature diversity in these areas. This review concludes that while psychologists are conducting the majority of sexual harassment research, organizational communication scholars need to do more research about sexual harassment, especially men's experiences as targets of sexual harassment.

Keywords: organizational communication, sexual harassment, men, gender, workplace, research methods

Introduction

In 1994, a television commercial[1] aired in the United States that encouraged people to go to their local libraries to read about sexual harassment. The commercial featured a man in an ostensibly supervisory role condescendingly encouraging a woman in his department to dress more provocatively if she hoped to advance in her job. She responds by declaring his behavior is sexual harassment, and then she says, "And I don't have to take it." While this commercial represents only one attempt to explain sexual harassment to an American audience, it depicted sexual harassment as people usually imagine it and as it most often occurs. Put another way, the commercial portrayed sexual harassment through a narrow lens that positioned higher-status men (e.g., supervisors, managers, bosses) as aggressors and lower-status women (e.g., employees, subordinates) as targets[2] of their physical or verbal abuse (Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Gutek, 1985; Martindale, 1990).

The development of sexual harassment as a recognized legal and psychological phenomenon, along with its social construction that typically features a male-to-female power structure (Foss, Foss, & Griffin, 2006), offers an important lens to understanding the research about men's experiences as targets of sexual harassment. Legal recognition of sexual harassment as a destructive phenomenon arose in the United States with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, signaling the onset of more comprehensive understandings of what had, arguably, always been taking place. Although women's studies scholarship is often credited with

coining *sexual harassment* as a term to describe what women in the workplace had been facing for decades, it was the Clarence Thomas-Anita Hill controversy[3] of the early 1990s that launched sexual harassment into national awareness (Baker, 2004; Black & Allen, 2001; Lawrence, 1996; Violanti, 1996).

Fitzgerald, Collinsworth, and Harned (2001) noted sexual harassment is legally defined as "uninvited sex-related behavior […] that is unwanted by and offensive to its target" (p. 991). Yet, defining what constitutes sexual harassment (especially vis-à-vis gendered individuals) is a matter of debate in academic research, a point we address later in this essay. *Sexual harassment* herein refers both to quid-pro-quo sexual harassment, meaning "explicit demands of sexual favors in exchange for work/academic advancement," and hostile workplace sexual harassment, which describes behaviors that contribute to a work environment that is unsafe and unproductive both for the explicit target of harassment and for others in the workplace (Pina, Gannon, & Saunders, 2009, p. 127; see also Applen & Kleiner, 2001; Roiphe, 1993; Sandler & Shoop, 1997; Wise & Stanley, 1987). Scholars generally agree that those two definitions fairly represent the types of sexual harassment, and that quid-pro-quo harassment is easily detectable. Which behaviors contribute to a hostile work environment and which are benign is a matter of perspective and has received much attention in the literature reviewed in this essay (Berdahl, Magley, & Waldo, 1996; Donovan & Drasgow, 1999).

Scholars have researched the issue of men's experiences as targets of sexual harassment for the last two decades, but extended research needs to be conducted to further this area of scholarship, especially within the communication discipline (Vaux, 1993). Taking into consideration the wealth of literature relative to men's experiences as targets of sexual harassment, in this essay we illustrate that: (1) sexual harassment is a way of asserting traditional, patriarchal conceptions of masculinity, even when the harassment is male-to-male; (2) white men are the least likely demographic to be accused of sexual harassment; (3) what women label as sexual harassment may not necessarily be experienced as sexually harassing by men; (4) many of the current methods for studying men's experiences of sexual harassment are inadequate; and (5) organizations need to consider the implications of sexual harassment research in their creation and implementation of workplace policies. Taken together, these findings elucidate the variance among men's and women's experiences of sexual harassment and suggest that more research needs to be conducted. Specifically, scholarship with respect to the relationship between power[4] and sexual harassment is important because sexual harassment is necessarily a communicative phenomenon with important impacts on organizations and the people therein (see Cleveland & Kerst, 1993; Dougherty, 2006, 1999; Taylor & Conrad, 1992).

Understanding the less-common manifestations of sexual harassment, such as female-to-male and male-to-male harassment, has serious implications for the academy, in fields ranging from sociology, psychology, and communication to the fields of business and law. Moreover, the legal ramifications of better understanding the sexual harassment of men are far ranging—illegal behavior targeted at men can be processed and assessed more fairly if we understand it. Specifical-

ly, we contend that organizational communication researchers should conduct scholarship that offers clear, prescriptive advice to organizational decision makers concerning workplace policies affecting male sexual harassment targets. Ideally, this research will come from scholars with a variety of theoretical positions and methodological approaches. The review that follows considers mostly post-positivistic scholarship because psychologists with a post-positivistic approach have conducted most of the research about men's experiences of sexual harassment. Citing much scholarly work that advances these ideas, we suggest communication researchers from an array of perspectives need to do more work to understand men's experiences of sexual harassment with a variety of methodologies.

Patriarchy, Power, and Privilege

As Johnson (2005) argued, "patriarchy puts issues of power, dominance, and control at the center of human existence, not only in relationships between men and women, but among men as they compete and struggle to gain status, maintain control, and protect themselves from what other men might do to them" (p. 42). Foss, Foss, and Griffin (2006) noted patriarchy is, at its simplest, the social construction of phenomena that emphasize the power and domination of men over women. Sexual harassment in the workplace draws on both well-defined and nuanced power dynamics that place women and less masculine men in almost powerless positions. Sexual harassment is dangerous no matter its target because it upholds traditional, exploitative, patriarchal notions of masculinity (Lee, 2000; Townsley & Geist, 2000). Ironically, it seems these traditional notions of the appropriate power dynamic within the workplace are so accepted within society that even the oppressed groups contribute to its perpetuation. For example, Townsley and Geist (2000) suggested targets of sexual harassment who treat their experience as a joke or as a natural part of the workplace are participating in their own subjugation. Whether women or men, people who treat sexual harassment as an innate part of the status quo are granting assent to it and reifying patriarchal oppression (Clair, 1993; Townsley & Geist, 2000). Townsley and Geist explained:

> Both men and women participate actively in hegemonic relations at the micro-level. Victims of sexual harassment participate in their own subordination and contribute to the production and reproduction of the dominant ideology by drawing upon particular framing devices in their narratives of harassment. (p. 197)

To combat this self-subordination, Stockdale, Visio, and Batra (1999) suggested organizations should work to mitigate all forms of sexual harassment because even sexual harassment against men contributes to the establishment of a hostile work environment. Even in cases where a woman is the aggressor, the incidence of sexual harassment in the workplace makes the workplace less safe because a patriarchal exercise of power over another has been at least tacitly tolerated. If the workplace does not value the dignity of the men who are harassed enough to

respond, it is likely a workplace that tolerates disrespect and the objectification of all its employees. When an organization accepts traditional gender roles and perpetuates a power dynamic that endangers some of its employees, it quite clearly accepts patriarchal notions of masculinity and femininity within the workplace.

Although sexual harassment as it is most often conceptualized includes a male harasser and a female target, research has found white men are the least likely group to be accused of sexual harassment (Wayne, Riordan, & Thomas, 2001). Moreover, when they are accused, they are judged less severely than other groups, illustrating white male privilege is rampant in cases of sexual harassment. In a study of mock jury decisions where research participants assumed the role of a juror in a sexual harassment case, Wayne, Riordan, and Thomas (2001) found that regardless of the gender of the juror, white male harassers with female targets were the least harshly judged. Participants found female harassers guilty more often than male harassers, and instances of same-sex harassment were judged more severely than cases of different-sex harassment (Wayne et al., 2001). Thus, in a patriarchal society where privileged, white, straight men have the most power and the most potential to engage in sexually harassing behaviors, this same group of people is the most immune from being accused and reprimanded for those behaviors (Wayne et al., 2001). Privileged offenders' relative ease at getting away with sexual harassment may be due to the fact that male-against-female harassment is now normalized and even heteronormative when contrasted with same-sex harassment.

Giuffre and Williams (1994) reached a similar conclusion when they found restaurant employees only regarded sexual behaviors as sexually harassing when the initiators of the sexual contact were in supervisory positions, or were from a different race or sexual orientation. The fact that sexually inappropriate and technically illegal behavior is interpreted as innocuous when it comes from straight white men is a clear indication that the biases people have can cloud their judgment of coworkers' behaviors. When decision makers in organizations are aware of their potential biases because of training programs and other organization-wide efforts to communicate about sexual harassment, they are better equipped to negate those biases and give a fair hearing to any report of sexual harassment, regardless of the sex, race, or sexual orientation of the target or the accused. Education about those biases and prescriptions from the organizational communication field for practitioners about how to combat such biases could improve organizational decision makers' abilities to respond fairly and effectively to reports of sexual harassment.

The Inadequacy of Methods for Assessing Men's Experiences of Harassment

Although the most common direction of sexual harassment is male-to-female, a wealth of scholarship shows men, too, are targets of sexual harassment in the workplace (Berdahl, Magley, & Waldo, 1996; Popovich, Campbell, Everton, Mangan, & Godinho, 1994; Waldo, Berdahl, & Fitzgerald, 1998). Vaux (1993) argued researching the sexual harassment experiences of men is

necessary because "the rates of harassment experiences reported by men [are] far higher than conventional wisdom [leads anyone] to expect, often similar to the rates for women" (p. 119; see also Waldo, Berdahl, & Fitzgerald, 1998). Waldo, Berdahl, and Fitzgerald (1998) estimated that as many as forty percent of men have experienced some form of sexual harassment in the workplace.

Nonetheless, in a cultural context of at least two millennia of patriarchy and a history fraught with almost exclusively male policymakers, the preponderance of research about sexual harassment has appropriately focused on the most common form of sexual harassment—male-to-female. As a symptom of the larger disease of patriarchy, sexual harassment necessarily reflects and perpetuates the power dynamics of patriarchy. Given that sexual harassment is based on power more than on sexual attraction or affection, a focus on women's experiences of sexual harassment makes sense because a patriarchal society, by definition, is one where men almost always have more power than women (Cleveland & Kerst, 1993; Pina et al., 2009; Vaux, 1993; Waldo et al., 1998).

The history of studying sexual harassment creates some challenges for research about men's experiences of sexual harassment. DeSouza and Solberg (2004) argued research about men as targets of sexual harassment is sparse, particularly with regard to the sexual orientation of the target. DeSouza and Solberg suggested gay men and men who act in conventionally feminine ways are especially vulnerable to sexual harassment at the hands of straight men, but since the topic has barely been researched, more work needs to be done in the field. Understanding power dynamics is particularly important in researching this type of sexual harassment, one that includes two seemingly powerful actors (i.e., men). Especially in workplaces that are predominantly staffed by men, harassment on the basis of real or perceived sexual orientation can be a way for men to exercise power over one another, positioning the most masculine men near the top of the power chain and the less masculine men at a place on the power chain traditionally reserved for women (DeSouza & Solberg, 2004; Donovan & Drasgow, 1999). Thus, power dynamics among same-gendered co-workers interrupt the typified directionality of sexual harassment. Understanding sexual harassment in the larger context of patriarchy illuminates the possibility of various aggressor-target relationships. Sexual harassment is thus a complex, gendered phenomenon that includes male-to-female, female-to-male, male-to-male, and female-to-female harassment. In any case, the vast complexity of sexual harassment underscores the inadequacy of attempting to explain it with any one research methodology, particularly from a post-positivistic perspective. Rather, it suggests contemporary approaches, defined by a changing social-political attitude towards diversity within sexual orientations, must also be applied to researching sexual harassment.

Most scholars who study sexual harassment do so with scale-based instruments, and the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ, Fitzgerald et al., 1988) is the most common tool for gauging experiences of sexual harassment. However, as Donovan and Drasgow (1999) argued, the SEQ cannot equivalently assess men's experiences of sexual harassment because it was originally created to gather data from female targets. Particularly, one of the questionnaire's major

flaws is it may omit questions about behaviors men would consider harassing that women would not find harassing. For instance, one question from the scale asks respondents if they have ever been treated differently at work because of their sex. This experience is uncommon for men because men often do not perceive they are being treated differently because of their sex. More importantly, it is the questions the survey does not ask that are troublesome for studies of men's experiences of sexual harassment. Men do report feeling harassed by hazing about acting feminine or by questions and jokes about penis size, and both of these are experiences the SEQ misses. Using the same scale for assessing men's experiences of sexual harassment is also problematic in theory because it ignores the relationship between sexual harassment and power as well as the different lived experiences of each target. The interaction of social role expectations and gendered privilege means sexual harassment is necessarily asymmetrical among male and female targets. As a result of these limitations to capturing men's experiences, Donovan and Drasgow suggested that a modified version of the scale be used for men instead. To that extent, the questionnaire should address the gendered interaction of the aggressor and the target because men may interpret behaviors of men differently than behaviors of women. For instance, men may not find staring or whistling by women sexually harassing, but they may find these same behaviors by men harassing. The incongruity between men's and women's reactions to staring and whistling again suggests men's and women's experiences as targets of sexual harassment are asymmetrical and vary with the gender and perceived sexual orientation of the aggressor.

Any instrument designed to capture men's experiences of sexual harassment also needs to consider the role of power in understanding sexual harassment. According to Pina et al. (2009), "patterns in western societies suggest that men typically hold more power than women, and the stereotypes prevailing between genders are that men are goal-oriented, powerful, and aggressive" (p. 131). Therefore, researchers must account for the dynamic of power rather than assuming sexual harassment is symmetrical, or the same for men as for women. Sexual harassment is an exercise of power and an usurpation of the target's power, so it cannot be monolithically understood. A Likert-type scale alone cannot wholly capture the communicative meaning in men's experiences of sexual harassment, particularly where issues of power are concerned. The richness of data from open-ended survey items or in-depth interviews promises to add much to understanding the nuanced ways men experience and react to sexual harassment.

The appropriateness of studying sexual harassment narratives is well documented, but most studies that examine narratives only consider women's stories (Bingham & Battey, 2005; Krolokke, 1998; Taylor & Conrad, 1992; Townsley & Geist, 2000; Wood, 1992). There are a few exceptions, however. Scarduzio and Geist-Martin (2008) provided critical analyses of narratives of two male professors who had experienced sexual harassment within academe; their examination illustrated the ways narratives (i.e., the sharing of one's story) become a way of healing fractured identities. Scarduzio and Geist-Martin (2010) expand narrative analysis to interrogate the ways in which ideological positioning shifts

within discourse about men's experiences with sexual harassment, and they contend that understanding the discursive practice of ideological positioning offers a way to better explain those experiences. Lee's (2000) study considered narratives of two men who have experienced sexual harassment in the workplace, one at the hands of a woman and one at the hands of another man. Lee's work is indicative of a qualitative approach to considering men's experiences with sexual harassment, and it rather dramatically illustrates some of the potential consequences of men's experience with sexual harassment. Indeed, of the two men's stories Lee shared, one eventually commits suicide as a result of the harassment, and the other attempts suicide.

Descriptive research about sexual harassment is intellectually generative, so additional interpretive, ethnographic, and narrative research from communication perspectives about men's experiences of sexual harassment would offer more insight into the topic and provide information about causes and helpful responses to it. Put another way, qualitative research of the variety that calls into question emotional responses and reactions to assumed sexual harassment, is an appropriate addition to measurements of both men's and women's experiences as targets of sexual harassment. Moreover, providing gender-sensitive conceptions of sexual harassment in surveys and other instruments will strengthen our understanding.

The Gendered Problems of Defining Sexual Harassment Categorically

Men and women may not find the same behaviors harassing, making it difficult to offer any one accurate definition of sexual harassment. For example, Berdahl, Magley, and Waldo (1996) reported women are likely to feel harassed by excessive flirting, but men tend to find the same behavior complimentary (see also Katz, Hannon, & Whitten, 1996; Shea, 1993). Insofar as the definition of sexual harassment presupposes the behaviors are uninvited and unwanted, most behaviors that can be sexually harassing are thusly labeled only circumstantially and contextually (Berdahl et al., 1996; Donovan & Drasgow, 1999). Excessive flirting is not sexual harassment if the target actively encourages it, enjoys it, or both. Only extreme behaviors, then, like rape and sexual imposition can categorically be classified as sexual harassment, and those are instances where the latter label is a legal and moral understatement (Vaux, 1993).

As Berdahl et al. (1996) noted the psychological definition of harassment requires a behavior be both stressful and threatening for the target. Indeed, "what women may experience as sexually harassing may more often be experienced by men as social-sexual behavior that is nonthreatening" (p. 529). DeFour et al. (2003) agreed, noting while women may feel annoyed or threatened by repeated sexual advances, "the great majority of men report that they are flattered by women's advances" (p. 37). The same, they suggest, is not necessarily true in same-sex episodes of harassment. When people appreciate the attention they are receiving and the attention is positive and healthy, the behavior is not sexual harassment, despite its potential agreement with legal definitions. Therefore, current estimates of men's experiences of sexual harassment may be inflated if the rates are based on a categorical classification of particular behaviors as

sexually harassing without a consideration of the target's emotional response to the behavior (Berdahl et al., 1996; Waldo, Berdahl, & Fitzgerald, 1998). In other words, if a man is given a questionnaire and asked whether he has experienced certain behaviors (e.g., whistling, staring) without a question about whether he found those behaviors harassing, the results would be skewed. The realization that different behaviors may be perceived as harassing or benign again suggests men and women interpret behaviors in varied ways, underscoring the necessity of revised methods for measuring men's experiences of sexual harassment.

Discussion and Implications

Biases in reporting sexually harassing behaviors can have important legal implications for organizations. Organizations and individuals are liable for sexual harassment, so organizational decision makers need to be aware of the predispositions that people in their organizations have regarding what counts as sexually harassing behavior. Organizational leaders who are responsible for creating and executing sexual ethics policies need to be aware men can be targets and that those least likely to be accused of harassment (i.e., white men) are also the most likely to be aggressors. Some researchers have found men who are targets of male-induced sexual harassment are unlikely to report the sexual harassment because of stigmas that associate their role as target with gayness (DuBois, Knapp, Faley, & Kustis, 1998). Specifically, some men fear that in reporting incidences of sexual harassment—especially but not exclusively those where men are the aggressors—they will be perceived as gay (Calderwood, 1987; Goyer & Eddleman, 1984). Power, then, functions not just in the commission of sexual harassment but also in the suppression of reporting about it, particularly for those who fear the stigma of being labeled as gay or for those who do not wish to be "outed" in this way. Men who decide not to report sexual harassment because they fear they could be perceived as gay choose heterosexual privilege over their own dignity. The decision not to report harassment for fear of being perceived as gay, which ostensibly allows the target to maintain some of his own power, is actually an act of submission that gives the aggressor even more power, leaving their harassing behavior unchallenged and thusly deeming it appropriate.

DuBois et al. (1998) also found the impact of sexual harassment on men is more devastating when the harasser is another man because being sexually harassed by another man challenges patriarchal notions of masculinity more than being harassed by a woman. Coupled with the finding that men are less likely to report same-sex harassment, this suggests the most harmful form of sexual harassment (i.e., male-to-male) is least likely to be reported. Thus, organizations' policies should proactively mitigate sexual harassment and intentionally endeavor to create contexts where targets will feel empowered to report sexual harassment.

Gruber (2006) argued the most effective sexual harassment policies are those that are best publicized as a part of the organization's culture (see also Hotchkiss, 1994). For example, Gruber found organizations with explicit policies against sexual harassment, clear procedures for reporting and responding to

sexual harassment, and training programs that informed employees about these policies experienced a decrease in incidences of sexual harassment and an increase in reporting behaviors when incidences did occur. Pina et al. (2009) argued that while a number of training programs do exist, and are effective in educating employers and employees about sexual harassment, they fall short because they do not address the power dynamics that underlie sexual harassment in the first place. In other words, training programs focus on behaviors rather than the socially constructed gender dynamics of patriarchal hegemony that perpetuate those behaviors—leaving the greater issue unaddressed and unresolved.

Unfortunately, the issue of whether sexual harassment is reported is just one part of an organization's responsibility related to sexual harassment. Another integral piece is whether the staff person in the organization who hears the allegation of sexual harassment takes the report seriously (Madera, Podratz, King, & Hebl, 2007). Popovich et al. (1994) discovered people find the less common types of sexual harassment less believable, especially when the situation includes a female aggressor and a male target (see also Madera et al., 2007). This finding, combined with the fact that men perceive a stigma (i.e., gayness) related to reporting sexual harassment, suggests that even in organizations with the best policies and the best intentions, the sexual harassment of men by both women and men is likely to be underreported and inadequately addressed, possibly leaving corporations vulnerable to several legal liabilities. Employers are liable any time a workplace is burdened by sexual harassment because the workplace becomes a hostile one for its employees. Unless the employer has made significant strides to prevent and respond to sexual harassment, the legal liability falls to the corporation (Kelly, Kadue, & Mignin, 2005).

The current research about the sexual harassment of men, while informative, leaves many questions unanswered. This review has demonstrated that researchers do know that current empirical methods for studying men's experiences of sexual harassment are inadequate, that women and men experience potentially harassing behaviors differently, that sexual harassment is related to a patriarchal understanding of masculinity defined by male-central power dynamics, that privileged people are the least likely to be accused of sexual harassment, and that the sexual harassment of men has real implications for organizational sexual ethics policies. While psychologists and sociologists have conducted most of this research, researchers from the field of organizational communication are relatively silent about men's experiences of sexual harassment.

This research gap is disappointing and surprising because sexual harassment policies and organizational understandings of masculinity and femininity are inexorably related to organizational culture. Further, an organization's decisions about how to communicate about sexual harassment have a significant influence on the way it defines sexual harassment and responds to such allegations. Moreover, how it communicates about sexual harassment provides the framework for how targets will respond to such actions within the workplace and cultivates their level of comfort with reporting alleged sexual harassment. Communication on the part of the organization could be particularly important concerning female-to-male and male-to-male incidents.

Sexual harassment is an important research topic for the fields of psychology, law, sociology, medicine, and gender studies, but the field of organizational communication could also bring a useful perspective to research about men's experiences with sexual harassment, especially related to organizations' cultures and structures. For example, organizational communication scholars are equipped with specific vocabularies to offer suggestions to organizations about ways to improve their cultures and climates communicatively. As organizational communication scholars conduct research on men's experiences of sexual harassment, two specific recommendations emerge from a synthesis of this review: (1) methodological triangulation is perhaps the most appropriate means of gathering data, and (2) research about training programs may be particularly useful. There are some general gender differences in defining behaviors as more or less harassing, so using the same scales to capture men's and women's experiences of sexual harassment is inadequate. Furthermore, because power is a central component of sexual harassment, scale-based research about sexual harassment is necessarily incomplete. The value of generalizable data about sexual harassment means that scale-based research is still useful and important, but at the same time, improved scales for men's experiences and additional interpretive research will help organizations learn more about the communicative richness of the sexual harassment experiences of men. Thus, mixed methodological approaches to studying men's experiences of sexual harassment are useful. Researchers should not abandon or rely entirely on any one way of understanding this issue. Most of the studies reviewed here used scale-based methods, and some used narrative or interpretive methods, but a combination of those methods promises to be particularly generative. For example, a study in which research participants respond to a traditional scale about sexual harassment and write brief narratives about their experiences would allow researchers to understand which parts of each person's experiences the scale captured, and the narratives would offer further explanation on those items as well as filling in the gaps for anything the scale missed. Alternatively, asking participants to take a traditional scale and then interviewing participants about the scale as a tool for explaining their experiences would offer a deeper understanding than either method by itself. Similar mixed methods studies could be used on either side of the implementation of a training program designed at curbing sexual harassment and raising awareness about the diversity of its impact.

Building on the findings that venerate the utility of sexual harassment training programs in organizations (DeSouza & Solberg, 2004; Giuffre & Williams, 1994; Pina et al., 2009), we recommend that research about the communicative effectiveness of training programs is an urgent need to which organizational communication scholars are equipped to respond. Lee (2000) asserted sexual harassment against men is often undergirded by restrictive definitions of ideal masculinity. Men who are targets of sexual harassment are often targeted because their harassers perceive that they are not masculine enough. Sexual harassment is therefore a form of sexism and moral exclusion (Vaux, 1993). DeSouza and Solberg (2004) suggested one of the best ways to subvert sexual harassment is to offer people alternatives to patriarchy by providing training

programs that educate members of an organization about the value of human diversity. When people begin to set aside the cultural construct of patriarchal oppression, sexual harassment will have less influence because protecting traditional masculinity will cease to be valuable for people. Following Pina et al. (2009), for instance, organizational communication scholars might develop training programs that not only educate employees about the technical and legal distinctions related to sexual harassment, but also address deeper questions about systemic power dynamics and the pervasiveness of hegemonic masculinity that bring about sexual harassment.

Scholars know training can be effective, however, answers to specific issues regarding what kind of training should be conducted, by whom, for whom, how often, for how long, and on what topics are unclear. Awareness-raising, especially about biases related to race, gender, and sexual orientation in the reporting and response to sexual harassment is an important first step in mitigating the problem of sexual harassment generally and the ignorance about men's experiences with sexual harassment specifically. Further research can uncover the most useful style, type, and duration of awareness-raising communication efforts. To the degree that sexual harassment is a communication phenomenon, communication can also be a part of its resolution.

Since 1974, when Carmita Wood resigned from her job because of several unwanted sexual advances and used the phrase sexual harassment in a lawsuit against her workplace, sexual harassment has changed from an insidious and nameless phenomenon that plagued countless workplaces to a problem that has been identified, labeled, and legislated against (Freedman, 2002). Nonetheless, sexual harassment still exists and remains harmful for women and men. While scholars from many different disciplines contribute much to knowledge about sexual harassment and how to mitigate it, men's experiences as targets of sexual harassment especially need continued scholarly attention. Specifically, organizational communication scholars are well-equipped to produce new knowledge that builds on the current literature and, more important, continues to work for the elimination of all forms of sexual harassment in the workplace. This literature review begins this work by planting the seed for future interrogation of men's experiences of sexual harassment and the ways in which the academy goes about defining, assessing, and dealing with those experiences.

References

Applen, H., & Kleiner, B. H. (2001). An overview of U.S. Supreme Court decisions in sexual harassment cases. *Managerial Law, 43,* 17-23.

Baker, C. N. (2004). Race, class, and sexual harassment in the 1970s. *Feminist Studies, 30,* 7-27.

Beasley, V. (n.d.). Anita Hill-Clarence Thomas Hearings. Retrieved January 9, 2010, from The Museum of Broadcast Communications' website: http://www.museum.tv/archives/etv/H/htmlH/hill-thomash/hill-thomas.htm

Berdahl, J. L., Magley, V. J., & Waldo, C. R. (1996). The sexual harassment of men? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20,* 527-547.

Bingham, S. G., & Battey, K. M. (2005). Communication of social support to sexual harassment victims: Professors' responses to a student's narrative of unwanted sexual attention. *Communication Studies, 56,* 131-155.

Black, A. E., & Allen, J. L. (2001). Tracing the legacy of Anita Hill: The Thomas/Hill hearings and media coverage of sexual harassment. *Gender Issues, 19,* 33-52.

Calderwood, D. (1987). The male rape victim. *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 21,* 53-55.

Clair, R. P. (1993). The use of framing devices to sequester organizational narratives: Hegemony and harassment. *Communication Monographs, 60,* 113-136.

Cleveland, J. N., & Kerst, M. E. (1993). Sexual harassment and perceptions of power: An under-articulated relationship. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42,* 49-67.

DeFour, D. C., David, G., Diaz, F. J., & Thompkins, S. (2003). The interface of race, sex, sexual orientation, and ethnicity in understanding sexual harassment. In M. Paludi & C. A. Paludi (Eds.), *Academic and workplace sexual harassment: A handbook of cultural, social science, management, and legal perspectives* (pp. 49-76). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

DeSouza, E., & Solberg, J. (2004). Women's and men's reactions to man-to-man sexual harassment: Does the sexual orientation of the victim matter?. *Sex Roles, 50,* 623-639.

Donovan, M. A., & Drasgow, F. (1999). Do men's and women's experiences of sexual harassment differ? An examination of the differential test function of the sexual experiences questionnaire. *Military Psychology, 11,* 265-282.

Dougherty, D. S. (2006). Gendered constructions of power during discourse about sexual harassment: Negotiating competing meanings. *Sex Roles, 54,* 495-507.

Dougherty, D. S. (1999). Dialogue through standpoint. *Management Communication Quarterly, 12,* 436-468.

DuBois, C. L. Z., Knapp, D. E., Faley, R. H., & Kustis, G. A. (1998). An empirical examination of same- and other-gender sexual harassment in the workplace. *Sex Roles, 39,* 731-749.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Collinsworth, L. L., & Harned, M. S. (2001). Sexual harassment. In J. Worell (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of women and gender* (Vol. 2) (pp. 991-1004). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Fitzgerald, L. F. Shullman, S., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, A., Ormerod, A. J., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32,* 152-175.

Freedman, E. B. (2002). *No turning back: The history of feminism and the future of women*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Foss, K. A., Foss, S. K., & Griffin, C. L. (2006). *Feminist rhetorical theories*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland.

Giddens, A. (1976). *New rules of sociological method: A positive critique of interpretive sociologies.* New York: Basic Books.

Giuffre, P. A., & Williams, C. L. (1994). Boundary lines: Labeling sexual harassment in restaurants. *Gender & Society, 8,* 378-401.

Goyer, P. F., & Eddleman, H. C. (1984). Same sex rape of non-incarcerated men. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 141,* 576-579.

Gruber, J. (2006). The impact of male work environments and organizational policies on women's experiences of sexual harassment. In P.J. Dubeck & D. Dunn (Eds.), *Workplace/women's place* (pp. 110-117). Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Gutek, B. A. (1985). *Sex and the workplace.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hall, S. (1985). Signification, representation, ideology: Althusser and the post-structuralist debates. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 2,* 91-114.

Hotchkiss, J. (1994). Ridding the workplace of sexual harassment. *Management Review, 83*(11), 57.

Johnson, A. G. (2005). Patriarchy, the system: An it, not a he, a them, or an us. In A.G. Johnson, *The gender knot: Unraveling our patriarchal legacy* (pp. 27-50). New Dehli: Pearson Education.

Katz, R., Hannon, R., & Whitten, L. (1996). Effects of gender and situation on the perception of sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 34,* 35-42.

Kelly, J. M., Kadue, D. D., & Mignin, R. J. (2005). Sexual harassment in the workplace: A United States perspective. *International Journal of Discrimination and the Law, 7,* 29-85.

Krolokke, C. (1998). Women professors' assertive-emphatic and non-assertive communication in sexual harassment situations. *Women's Studies in Communication, 21,* 91-103.

Lawrence, J. (1996). A rose by any other name might smell as sweet, but it wouldn't come in dozens on Valentine's Day: How *sexual harassment* got its name. *Journal of American Culture, 19,* 15-23.

Lee, D. (2000). Hegemonic masculinity and male feminisation. *Journal of Gender Studies, 9,* 141-155.

Madera, J. M., Podratz, K. E., King, E. B., & Hebl, M. R. (2007). Schematic responses to sexual harassment complaints: The influence of gender and physical attractiveness. *Sex Roles, 56,* 223-230.

Martindale, M. (1990). *Sexual harassment and the military: 1988.* Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center.

Pina, A., Gannon, T. A., & Saunders, B. (2009). An overview of the literature on sexual harassment: Perpetrator, theory, and treatment. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 14,* 126-138.

Popovich, P. M., Campbell, K. L., Everton, W. J., Mangan, M. R., & Gidinho, R. M. (1994, April). *Perceptions of traditional and alternative forms of sexual harassment.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Nashville.

Roiphe, K. (1993). *The morning after: Sex, fear and feminism.* London: Hamish Hamilton.

Sandler, B. R., & Shoop, R. J. (1997). What is sexual harassment? In B. R. Sandler & R. J. Shoop (Eds.), *Sexual harassment on campus: A guide for administrators, faculty, and students* (pp. 1-21). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Scarduzio, J. A., & Geist-Martin, P. (2008). Making sense of fractured identities: Male professor's narratives of sexual harassment. *Communication Monographs, 75*, 369-395.

Scarduzio, J. A., & Geist-Martin, P. (2010). Accounting for victimization: Male professor's ideological positioning in stories of sexual harassment. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *24*, 419-445.

Shea, M. (1993). The effects of selective evaluation on the perception of female cues in sexually coercive and noncoercive males. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *22*, 415-432.

Spry, T. (1995). In the absence of word and body: Hegemonic implications of "victim" and "survivor" in women's narratives of sexual violence. *Women & Language, 18,* 27-32.

Stockdale, M. S., Visio, M., & Batra, L. (1999). The sexual harassment of men: Evidence for a broader theory of sexual harassment and sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 5*, 630-664.

Taylor, B., & Conrad, C. (1992). Narratives of sexual harassment: Organizational dimensions. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 20,* 401-418.

Townsley, N. C., & Geist, P. (2000). The discursive enactment of hegemony: Sexual harassment and academic organizing. *Western Journal of Communication, 64,* 190-217.

Vaux, A. (1993). Paradigmatic assumptions in sexual harassment research: Being guided without being misled. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42,* 116-135.

Violanti, M. T. (1996). Hooked on expectations: An analysis of influence and relationships in the Tailhook Reports. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 24,* 67-82.

Waldo, C. R., Berdahl, J. L., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1998). Are men sexually harassed? If so, by whom? *Law and Human Behavior, 22,* 59-79.

Wayne, J. H., Riordan, C. M., & Thomas, K. M. (2001). Is all sexual harassment viewed the same? Mock juror decisions in same- and cross-gender cases. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 179-187.

Wise, S., & Stanley, L. (1987). *Georgie Porgie: Sexual harassment in everyday life*. London: Pandora.

Wood, J. T. (1992). Telling our stories: Narratives as the basis for theorizing sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 20*, 349-362.

Notes

1. A copy of this commercial can be found at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vP7kPrdayTM
2. We choose the word *target* rather than *victim* for two reasons. First, as Spry (1995) argued, *victim* is a hegemonic term that often (in discourse about sexual violence or sexual harassment) explains (mostly) women's experiences in

men's terms. Such a move is problematic and disempowering to the agency of the target. Second, what sexual harassment means for men is part of the question this essay seeks to address. Put another way, current discourse often suggests that men are *victims* of sexual harassment, although those men may not consider the behaviors described as sexually harassing to be offensive or unwanted. While both terms are inadequate, *target* is more precise in this case.

3. Anita Hill made sexual harassment allegations against current Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court Clarence Thomas during his confirmation hearings. Hill's testimony, aired on public television in 1991, brought national attention to sexual harassment in the workplace. While the allegations held no legal repercussions, Beasley noted, "to many observers they symbolized a public referendum on sexual harassment and other gender inequities in late twentieth-century America" (n.d.).
4. Giddens (1976, p. 111) functionally defined power as "the capacity of the actor to intervene in a series of events so as to alter their course; as such [power] is the 'can' that mediates between intentions or wants and the actual realization of the outcome sought." Within the context of sexual harassment, power becomes especially important when it is hegemonic, that is, when the targets accept their marginalization as normative (Hall, 1985).